W584.4
M312.4rC



BERKELEY, CALIFORNIA

THE GIFT OF

Manchester College

1.1
.4R0

V. Edwin Odgers.

MANCHESTER NEW COLLEGE.

REMOVAL FROM

LONDON TO OXFORD.

REVISED REPORT OF THE DEBATE AT THE ANNUAL MEETING

OF TRUSTEES HELD AT UNIVERSITY HALL, JUNE 28, 1888.

(*Reprinted from the* INQUIRER *Supplement of July 14, 1888.*)

Property of
CBSK
Please return to
Graduate Theological
Union Library

LONDON :

PRINTED BY WOODFALL AND KINDER,

70 TO 76, LONG ACRE, W.C.

HS84.1
M312.4n0

TRUSTEES' ANNUAL MEETING.

MANCHESTER NEW COLLEGE was founded at Manchester 1786, was removed to York 1803, was restored to Manchester 1840, was transferred to London 1853, and now, by decision of the Trustees, is to be further transferred to Oxford. It has been domiciled in London at University Hall, Gordon-square, and has been closely connected with the University of London, upwards of one hundred alumni of the College having matriculated or graduated in that University in the last forty-seven years. The College is free from all tests or doctrinal subscription, and constantly declares that it "*adheres to its original principle of freely imparting Theological knowledge, without insisting on the adoption of particular Theological doctrines.*" Most of its subscribers are connected with Unitarian or Free Christian Churches, and its theological students generally look forward to pastorates among Unitarians. Dr. James Drummond is the Principal, and he is assisted by Professors J. Estlin Carpenter and C. Barnes Upton. During the past year twelve students have been under tuition at University Hall, but there are several external scholarships held by undergraduates elsewhere.

The Annual Meeting of Trustees was held June 28, at University Hall. There was a large attendance, including:—The President, H. R. Greg, Revs. H. E. Dowson, S. A. Steinthal, T. L. Marshall, A. Gordon, J. Robberds, W. Blazeby, G. Evans, D. Walmsley, F. H. Jones, H. Ierson, P. H. Wicksteed, R. A. Armstrong, C. Hargrove, Dr. T. Sadler, P. M. Higginson, Dr. J. Drummond, J. E. Carpenter, C. B. Upton, W. H. Drummond, H. Solly, C. C. Coe, H. Gow, Dr. Martineau, T. Robinson, C. J. Street, L. P. Jacks, Dr. C. A. Greaves, R. T. Herford, J. H. Muirhead, W. Carey Walters, E. S. Anthony, E. S. Howse, L. Jones, F. K. Freeston, V. D. Davis, E. I. Fripp, P. Prime, J. Harwood, W. M. Ainsworth, H. S. Tayler, P. Vancesmith, J. T. Whitehead, R. Shaen, J. Worthington; Messrs. E. B. Squire, H. W. Gair, A. W. Worthington, W. H. Herford, R. D. Darbishire, J. Lupton, S. B. Worthington, C. W. Jones, B. Heape, T. Worthington, J. H. Brooks,

23947

J. T. Preston, F. Nettlefold, Professor Morley, Sir R. K. Wilson, W. B. Bowring, I. S. Lister, J. Wellings, Dr. Blake Odgers, R. Harrop, D. Martineau, W. Thornely, P. Worsley, E. H. Grundy, W. C. Coupland, A. H. Worthington, W. Haslam, W. Lant Carpenter, I. M. Wade, W. Ashton, F. Monks, Dr. Aspland, W. Long, D. Ainsworth, S. S. Tayler, P. M. Clayden, L. Lewis, Henry Tate, G. W. Rayner Wood; Mrs. T. Smith Osler, Mrs. Case, Miss H. E. Higginson, Mrs. Gow, Miss Thornely, and others. We are asked to state that business engagements of an urgent character necessarily drew away some Trustees before the close of the proceedings, which were protracted from eleven in the morning till a quarter-past five in the afternoon. In several such cases gentlemen of opposite opinions paired before leaving.

After the transaction of the ordinary business of the Annual Meeting, an account of which was given in the *Inquirer* of June 30, the meeting proceeded to the discussion of the proposals submitted by the Committee relative to the removal of the College to Oxford.

Mr. R. D. Darbishire, one of the Secretaries, having read the notice convening the special meeting, the Report was taken as read.

Mr. Darbishire

then mentioned a correction which it was necessary to make in the Report. On page fourteen, in the middle of paragraph three, were the words, "It is remarkable that these lectures are practically unattended except by the Mansfield students, and they are welcomed by the professors most heartily." Dr. Driver, Regius Professor of Hebrew, had written a note, requesting that that statement might be corrected, because it did not give a fair representation as to the attendance of the general students. He would prefer that the sentence be put in this form: "These lectures have of late, in several cases, been attended by the Mansfield students, and they are welcomed by the professors most heartily." After the Committee meeting yesterday there was a discussion as to the best mode of bringing the question, of which the Committee have given notice, before the meeting, and it was considered that the resolution appeared, so to speak, to start a great many hares, which might distract the attention of a large meeting of this kind, and they proposed to ask the meeting to allow them to substitute for the long resolution simply the following: "That the College be removed from London and established at Oxford." This is with the sole intention of putting one single question before so large a meeting. After a decision is come to upon that question many other details could be solved, and the Committee therefore ask leave to substitute that motion for the other. The meeting approved of the change.

The Rev. Dr. Greaves moved "That the draft report be received and entered upon the minutes."

The Rev. J. Robberds seconded the motion, which was carried.

The Secretary then read the following letters from absent Trustees :—

DEAR MR. DARBISHIRE,—I am very sorry that public business prevents my attending the meeting of the Manchester New College Trustees on Thursday.

It is impossible for me to express to you how strongly I feel the importance of our removing the College to Oxford. It is a matter of great grief to me that Mansfield College has had the start of us.

I do think it belonged to us to have been the first to make the move, and I do hope we shall suffer no other body to rob us of the second place.

Our young men—I mean, of course, the theological students—are turned out very accomplished scholars, and after passing through a Hibbert course become learned men; but their efficiency is greatly hindered by want of that mixture with the world which rubs off the sharp angles and renders familiar intercourse with strangers so much more natural and easy.

I am sure that Oxford would be glad to receive us, and why any of our friends should be so anxious to shut up our young students in this nineteenth century within the narrow walls of a semi-monastic seminary does greatly surprise me.

I should suppose that no other city in the world possesses such vast intellectual resources as Oxford, and nothing less than the best in that way seems to me to be good enough for us.

I hold up both my hands for you, and shall lose all faith in the future if we permit all the world to go in in front of us.—Yours very truly,

W. P. PRICE.

Reform Club, Pall Mall, S.W., June 25.

DEAR MR. DARBISHIRE,—I have twice read with much care the Special Report of the Committee. It seems to me a singularly wise and judicious statement, and the natural outcome of the past history and of the present position of the College. As representing the old English Presbyterians, the chief upholders of learning and free religious thought in England among Nonconformists, it behoves the College to avail itself of the rights it has helped to win, and to plant itself in Oxford, where it can receive and give benefits. No part of the Special Report has given me greater pleasure than the suggestion "that Manchester New College lectures should be open to all members of the University without charge; and that, on the other hand, the work of Manchester New College students should be tested by scholars unconnected with it." That is eminently worthy of the traditions of the College and of the men who have so worthily represented it to the world.

I am glad to see that some far-seeing friend years ago secured a piece of land in Oxford for the purposes of the College. When it shall be said, "Let us rise up and build," it will be a privilege to me to be one "to strengthen their hands for this good work."

Stretton, Birkdale, June 19. WALTER ASHTON.

MY DEAR SIR,—I am in thorough sympathy with the removal of the College to Oxford, and regret that I can not pen down my reasons, owing to nervousness in the right hand.

Altrincham, June 25. G. H. WELLS.

DEAR DARBISHIRE,—I am extremely sorry that, having to officiate at a marriage on Thursday, I shall be unable to be present at the meeting of Trustees of Manchester New College. Were I present, I should vote, without hesitation, for its removal to Oxford. I have arrived at this conclusion by slow steps, and am indeed a convert.

The subject involves such large issues, and there are so many arguments that can be fairly adduced on either side, that it is impossible in a brief letter to do justice to the many considerations by which I have been influenced ; one or two points, however, I may venture to state.

1. It seems to me of vital importance that our students should not only receive the kind of culture which is obtained at the National Universities by those destined for the service of Church and State in every department of our national activity, but that they should have the opportunity of coming into personal contact with the young men who will become the foremost men in England when they enter upon the struggles of the world.

2. The life at a national university is in itself an education of the highest kind. The mere attendance at classes at University College, London, furnishes no corresponding discipline of thought or character.

3. At a national university the students destined for our Ministry will meet more of the young men of the educated families connected with our churches than in any other place.

4. Not only are the greatest teachers to be found in connection with a national university, but their personal influence is immediately and directly brought to bear upon its students.

5. Devout young men who are anxious to become Christian ministers, but shrink from "subscription," will learn from our College of the existence of a group of free churches ; and find an open path to our pulpits.

6. The experience of the Mansfield College is altogether favourable. Principal Fairbairn assures me that his college has been heartily welcomed, and that every respect has been paid to it by the authorities of the University, while not a few students not connected with the Congregational body have come under its influence. Manchester New College, by virtue of the principles on which it is based and the ripe scholarship of its professors, cannot fail to become at least an equal power.

7. Our students are gravely in danger under the present arrangements of forming a small and separate body, having little intercourse of any fruitful kind except among themselves alone ; it is peculiarly needful, however, that they should mingle with the many men of many minds who congregate at a national university, since by the breadth and generosity of their thoughts and sympathies the value of their work in our free churches will be largely determined. London is so vast, that our few students are driven to associate much more exclusively with each other than would be the case at a national university ; and their sectarian isolation is therefore likely to be more complete than it ought to be for their proper training as future ministers of the free churches of England.

For these and many other reasons I greatly hope the verdict of the Trustees will be given in favour of removal to Oxford.

Birmingham, June 24. HENRY W. CROSSKEY.

DEAR SIR,—I have had some experience of college life in London, having been a student in University Hall ; I have also had many relations who have passed through Oxford and Cambridge. It is my conviction that if Manchester New College is to hold its place and to do real service to the Unitarian body it must migrate, and I should vote for its location in Oxford if I were at the meeting of Trustees.

I know that students in London are isolated and not associated. In Oxford the life is one which brings them into contact with cultured men, and men of refinement socially. In London you have the highest

academic training, with little chance of forming those friendships which are of the most advantage to you in your course through the world. As a man who has come into contact with many prominent business and political personages, it is my experience that if you are to accomplish anything as a teacher and a guide of others you must feel "at home" with the leaders of other bodies on personal grounds; and if it has been your mischance to have lost this occasion of equal standing on the threshold of early manhood, you will feel it (how keenly many know) a life-long disqualification. You want your ministers to stand in every place on an equal footing with ministers of the Establishment; then give them equal opportunities.

Gledhow Hall, Leeds, June 27. JAMES KITSON.

DEAR MR. DARBISHIRE,—The meeting of Trustees of Manchester New College meet, I believe, to-morrow, to consider the advisability or otherwise of moving the College to Oxford. I am sorry I shall not be able to be present at this meeting, that I might, at any rate, have been able to raise my hand in favour of the movement. The considerations that weigh with me in supporting this action are:—First, that I believe the College does little or no good now where it is; the day of isolation and feeble protest against intolerance are over, and we Nonconformists are allowed to, and can, stand with as bold a front as any other section of the community before the face of the world and its criticism; the fathers of our young men and the young men themselves wish, I believe, to obtain their education in the most favoured places, and that they should mix with other young men of different opinions, of equal social standing, of equal freedom of thought, and of respect and consideration for one another which the mixing with numbers demands. It is my opinion that we Unitarians have been too long willing to remain in shade or obscurity. This is no doubt the result of previous oppression; but all this having now gone, through the exertions of our fathers, it is for us to show that we are ready to accept the freedom granted, and proclaim ourselves openly if we have anything to proclaim, and move amidst the rest and get the corners and angles of our composition, which have naturally formed themselves upon us for want of rubbing, cleared away.

To move the College to Oxford would, in my opinion, conduce to this end: it would be the means of brightening ourselves, and perhaps some others, who have hitherto always looked coldly upon us, may when they know us better find out that we are not quite as black as we are painted. This last, however, is of course but a small matter, and not really one worthy of a moment's consideration. The simple question for solution is, will the proposed move prove beneficial to our young men, and increase the character and usefulness of the College itself? In my opinion it will. I do not know if there will be any disposition at the meeting to consider a name for the College in case removal should be decided upon, but I think the present title might be very easily improved. In actions of this kind the money question is sure to crop up; but I do not think it ought to be one to check good purpose if there are arguments otherwise sufficient to support it. GEORGE HOLT.

Liverpool, June 27.

The Rev. HENRY SOLLY: Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen, several letters have been read in favour of the resolution, may I ask if there are any against it?

Mr. DARBISHIRE: I should certainly have read them if any had been received—(hear, hear).

The CHAIRMAN then called on the Rev. J. E. Odgers to move the resolution proposed by the Committee.

THE REV. J. E. ODGERS.

Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen,—I rise with a very strong feeling of the trust which the Committee have reposed in me, and of the responsibility which I incur, when I ask you to accept and pass the resolution that Manchester New College be moved from London and established in Oxford. I feel, as I say, very deeply the responsibility both of the position which I now hold and of the crisis which brings us together to-day. That responsibility I share with every member of the Committee. Those who have been in the majority, and those who have been in the minority, alike have most industriously, studiously, and with single heart set themselves to find out and recommend only that which might be best for the College. I wish to bear testimony, if I may, to the perfect temper in which the whole of these discussions have been conducted, and I think it is right to say that the two minority Reports which were presented to us would, if the writers had consented, have appeared on the paper, together with the majority Report, which I hold in my hand. There is a strong element of personal reminiscence and regret in the feeling which oppresses me to-day. The connection which I have with this building was one of the first I ever formed, and one of those which most strongly influences every issue of my life—(hear, hear). With University College also I had most pleasant and loyal relations, and I was here brought into contact with many whose names are conspicuous in many walks of public life and special study, and I there made friendships which have lasted until now. But the brilliant names which are connected with its past do not help any effort to maintain a connection with that college which has now gradually dwindled away and died. It is a fact that we, by placing our undergraduate students in connection at once with University College and with the University of London, have laid upon them a double obligation, which has been a distraction; for University College, like many other of the great teaching bodies which were of oid affiliated colleges of London University, has been for some time in open revolt against the University system, and now desires to follow the example of Owens and other colleges in the North, and set up a degree-giving body on its own account. I will not say anything critical of University College now, except that we have not found that it has best served our turn in the education of our undergraduates, and if University College does not best serve our purpose, even if we let our men take what advantages University College could give them to the full, they are not necessarily thereby prepared for graduating in the University of London. That is our dilemma; and with regard to the

University of London itself, we, in carrying on some inquiries a short time ago as to the causes of the failure of our own undergraduates in their Arts Examinations, found that the great majority of those who took Arts degrees in the University of London did not do so in the ordinary term of an undergraduate's training at college. We demanded matriculation as a condition of entrance; we expected our men to graduate in two years, but we were obliged to lengthen the term to an optional third, and ever since it has so happened that we have failed in individual cases now and then, even with this long term, and the large expense of the additional year. The University of London has only one intermediate and one final Arts Examination per annum, so that one who fails in one subject has to wait a whole year, at our expense, until he can present himself again. This has been a matter in connection with the University of London which has not been satisfactory. Now the proposal which I make, that we should remove to Oxford, is a wholly different one from that which was debated and rejected in 1879. As to any project of going as an affiliated College or licensed Hall I am content to adopt the words written some time ago in the *British Quarterly* by Dr. Fairbairn with respect to the removal of the old Spring Hill foundation to Oxford as Mansfield College:—"It would be an immense blunder to attempt to form a Nonconformist College on the model, say, of Keble or Selwyn. The reasons against it are many, denominationalism within the Universities being to us a mischievous and anti-national element. We would not withdraw our men from the older colleges, would rather encourage them to enter there, live their undergraduate life, and pursue their literary or scientific studies in connection with them. We could conceive nothing more disastrous than founding a school that should be in any degree responsible for these studies, or that should seek reputation by preparing its men for any arts school or tripos." We propose to send Manchester New College to Oxford as a theological college, offering what is practically an honours course to men who are already graduates, and giving a distinct inducement to our external scholars to become collegiate students in the University of Oxford and graduate there, and discouraging their becoming non-collegiate students. We propose to avail ourselves of whatever we can use, with fidelity to principle, and in the interests of broad and liberal culture. While Churches differ, while it may be very long before sympathy stretches full and free across ecclesiastical borders, there are two realms in which men of sincerity meet freely. The first is that of scholarship and philosophical thought and investigation. There is always an appeal to the men who know. The anathemas of Churches die away in their presence; and can we forget that at Oxford certainly there is as much as in any place in England or on the Continent of that full and free recognition of conscientious liberty in the departments of study and inquiry? And surely it may prove that the single-hearted devotedness of a life to truth, to religious culture and religious sympathy, does not go without Oxford recognition, if I allude to the honour so

recently conferred on one whose name is always present in our thoughts—I refer to Dr. Martineau—(cheers). Many years ago a few of us associated with this place, old pupils of the beloved and revered John James Tayler, gathered together to form a little theological society called by his name. Two of those professors, whose classes are open to us if we go to Oxford, were among the earliest members of that little society, and brought the light of their learning to our little meetings in the room above—(cheers). Another point on which men of all speculative views meet and strike hands of fellowship is practical work, and when a man, in face of the great difficulties which now agitate society, enrols himself in the list of those who would follow the steps of Oxford men, like Toynbee and Acland, it is not likely reference will be made to his position with regard to a Nicene theology. This last brings me to consider the relation of the older universities to the people, in the life of England to-day. They were formerly practically the happy hunting grounds of the gilded youth, with the small exception of a few patient scholars, who were either studying for orders or to become tutors or schoolmasters. Now you meet with these universities at every turn of social life—the Local Examinations, the University Extension Classes. Oxford men have devoted themselves to co-operative and industrial questions, and I need scarcely remind you that our own external scholar at Oriel is the Thomas Hughes scholar, as the son of a working-man co-operator. There are things which strike one among the industrial population of the north as showing a great and real change in the general feeling, for not only those of us who are able to send our sons to the great public schools think with pleasure that our boys, if they are good enough, may be some day put in the first flight, where a really national recognition is sure to follow, but we have our vast middle class schools, where the fees are within the reach of all, bringing a much wider circle into connection with the Universities—schools like the great Manchester Grammar School, which is now passing through the Honour schools at Oxford, from ten to fifteen men a year, many of them being Nonconformists. Now does not this alter our view with regard to the kind of attainment which we may reasonably suppose to be available for the young men who seek to enter Manchester New College? We propose that our men should have the advantages of a social recognition, and a life of sympathy with many active forms of thought and work, from which they are at present shut out. I cannot expect that anyone will meet me by saying that it is our duty to be absent. Our laity do not think so, and a great proportion of our ministers do not think so. We are actually sending our sons to those Universities, and if we send our sons, can it be wrong to send our students? Can it be wrong, so to speak, for ourselves to go after them?—(hear, hear). If we are to be deterred by a little coldness and tardiness of recognition, why are we sending our young laymen there to bear the brunt of it all themselves without the help that we might give them? We are laying on our young laity the charge of representing in the Universities our old free reverent Nonconformity, and do we shrink

from letting our divinity students have their share of obloquy if need be, of coldness if need be? I may be told that the significance and purpose of our college may be misunderstood. Better so, than never heard of: for what is misunderstanding but a challenge to explain? If there were no chances of misunderstanding, if the principles of free learning and free teaching were a matter of universal or popular recognition, if reverent freethought, if deep religious feeling, combined with critical keenness, were taken and assumed as a matter of course, why then we might sing our *Nunc Dimittis* and be glad that our days of testimony were numbered and finished. But we do not go to set up any propaganda; we do not go to carry warfare into an enemy's camp; we go standing on our own time-honoured principles and claiming for them an equal and respectful hearing. I have already said that we propose that our undergraduate scholarships shall be tenable at the Oxford College by men who shall be collegiate students. We do not encourage our men to enrol themselves as non-collegiate students, although they may do so. The non-collegiate students are somewhat out of the life of the University, and are for the most part men not seeking honours. We propose that our theological scholarships shall be sufficient, with reasonable economy, to keep our theological students who have already graduated as unattached men, save, of course, in the case of those who have been our Oxford graduates, who will, so to speak, belong to the place, and may if they like still keep up their connection with their old colleges, on whose books their names will be—(hear, hear). We believe our unattached students will be on a different footing from the ordinary unattached pass men. Then, in addition to our own Chairs, they will have open to them the whole of the lectures of University professors and readers. Thus many of the Mansfield men, in addition to their own lectures, take the opportunity offered of attending the lectures of such men as Dr. Cheyne, Dr. Driver, Dr. Hatch, and others. But why, it may be said, do we send or desire to send our undergraduates to Oxford? Well, we think that apart from the fact that we desire their association with our professors and that they are able to form a natural nexus between our college and the rest of the University, there are general and specific grounds. I should find it difficult to state the case briefly; I will only say this, that I believe that the distinctive Oxford course of *Literæ Humaniores* is a course to which the greatest teachers in Oxford are devoting their lives, and that it is the best preparation that is offered at present by any teaching body in the United Kingdom for a man who desires to follow theological studies. I can only point out that the collegiate system at Oxford is now very largely modified; that not only can any undergraduate of the University attend any professorial lectures, just as if he were at a University in Germany, except that he attends for nothing, but that under the new scheme, the old plan of inter-collegiate lectures among associated colleges has given place to a wider one. The Vice-Chancellor himself gives notice every term of the tutorial lectures which

are open in various colleges to students of all colleges, so that the educational advantages for specific students are such as it is hard to exaggerate. I turn away from this—simply speaking of one objection. It has been said to me by some friends of the College that this is purely an ideal scheme, that could only enter the realms of practical politics if we could show probabilities of our being able within a reasonable time to carry it out ; if we could show a list of names, if we could should show a list of contributions, that would have an overwhelming weight. It appears to me that this is a broad question of principle and expediency, and I would not seek for one moment to parade before you even venerated names, much less would I think to influence the balance of your judgment by tossing a heavy purse into the scale. I would only remind you that this College of ours, which celebrated two years ago its one hundredth birthday, is the old Manchester Academy of Manchester, York, and London, and, as we were then reminded, has a previous history taking us through the several stages of its wandering life in Yorkshire, Westmoreland, Cumberland, Derbyshire, and Lancashire, back to the time when, in 1670, Richard Franklin entered the name of the first student in his family house at Rathmel. The inheritance of the College, is it the heritage of Cain? It was once a wanderer on the face of the earth in time of persecution. It has since been a wanderer because the government of the College from time to time, at the bidding of expediency and the consideration of that which was the very best thing, has sent it here and there. The pictures that we reverence in the library represent not a London history, but an English history—(hear, hear). And has the time not already come when we may take up our pilgrim staff again, and listen, it may be with regret, with bowed head, but surely with faith, surely with newly quickened hope, to the call which comes to us and says, "Arise ye, and depart, for this is not your rest"?

The Rev. P. H. Wicksteed.

Mr. Chairman, it is not necessary for me to say that I rise under an almost overwhelming sense of personal responsibility, lost only in that feeling of common responsibility which must weigh on the heart of every Trustee here to-day. I have to lay one or two points before my fellow Trustees, and I am thankful that they assume the form of material and matter-of-fact statements which will lighten in some degree the tension under which all of us who have our hearts in this Institution must feel that we are existing to-day. I wish, then, to make a plain business statement, in order that those Trustees who have not been acquainted with the details of the management may understand why it is that the Committee no longer feel justified in incurring and continuing the financial responsibility in which they now stand. The accounts of the Hall—I am dealing in round figures—show an unfavourable balance of £150 on three years taken together, and a favourable balance of £300 taken on the two other years, or on the whole

a favourable balance on the five working years, for which the accounts are complete, of about £150—(cheers). But it should be clearly understood what that means, and how that result is arrived at. Manchester New College has expended a sum approaching £6,500 in furnishing, in beautifying, in extending these premises, and in the legal expenses connected therewith. On that sum interest at five per cent. has been allowed, but nothing has been allowed for depreciation. Considering that over £2,000 of that sum has been spent on the furniture which has been used—I say it with all kindness and respect—by students who did not pay for it—(laughter)—and who will not even have to undergo the inconvenience of any damage they may inflict upon it, I think I am safe in stating that an allowance of seven-and-a-half per cent. on depreciation of the furniture is not extravagant—(hear, hear). If that allowance were made it would amount to a sum of over £1,000, which would, after extinguishing the balance of £150, then absorb the greater part of the £1,200 which had been allowed for interest. So that we have an altogether trifling sum allowed as interest on the £6,000 expended. That is only allowing depreciation on the cost of furniture, &c. The building which we have erected is a property on which we ought certainly to allow for depreciation, even apart from the grave consideration which is now actually present to us of some of the rooms being empty, and involving us in the possibility of a heavy current loss. If an allowance were made upon that, it would not only extinguish the whole of the interest but show a further loss during the four or five years of occupancy of something like £1,300. So that we are practically minus the whole interest on our investment of £6,000, and have no prospect of any improvement in the situation. Now I have a strong feeling about the justifiableness or advisability of having gone into what cannot be otherwise than a speculative investment on the part of the Trustees; for to take a building which involves keeping up large residential premises with all its risks seems to me to be a kind of speculation which it is, to say the least, quite open to question whether it is under any circumstances desirable or advisable that the Committee of this College should enter. But, at any rate, it seems perfectly clear, whether it was justified under the circumstances or not, that it has not turned out to be of a character which we can encourage the Committee to continue, or which the Committee would, in the least degree, feel themselves justified in continuing. That is therefore the present position of the Committee. They come to you in regard to the present affairs and say, as I understand it, "We do not feel justified in continuing this state of things, therefore the *status quo* must be regarded as dissolved, and the question is not, are we to continue as we are, or to take such and such a move, but what are we to substitute for the present arrangement?" It is desirable that it should be known that these accounts which I have given include, amongst the receipts of the Hall, £200 a year on behalf of the rooms occupied by Manchester New College, and also, roughly speaking, £200 a year paid in extra bursaries to the students in order to enable them to have the

privilege of residing in the Hall. That, then, is the financial position, and if any further elucidation is required, Mr. Darbishire or Mr. Dowson will be ready to give it. As there is some misapprehension, I believe, on the subject, I thought it would be well, and I was requested by the Committee, to make a brief statement ; and I trust it has been a clear one. I shall proceed to the second point which I wish to take up. It has been touched on by Mr. Odgers already, but it is a matter on which I feel so strongly that I cannot refrain from saying one or two words about it When our fathers cried out for the opening of the older Universities,and desired to give their sons the privileges of graduating therein, from which they had been conscientiously excluded themselves, they had no notion whatever of playing the part of ringing the bell, and then, when the door was opened, disappearing round the corner. It was inevitable, then, that men who meant anything by the action to which they had devoted a large part of their lives should send their sons to exercise the privileges which they had so earnestly sought to obtain for them. Men of my age have witnessed the whole process through which by the sole pressure of the inevitable conditions the full force of that action became gradually manifested, and the men whom we saw by our sides, the undergraduates and graduates of London University, see their younger brothers as graduates of the Oxford and Cambridge Universities—(hear, hear). Now we have lived to see the process advanced another stage by the system which encourages our students for the ministry to take their degrees at the older universities, and through their open doors our younger contemporaries have already entered, and our successors are entering now. The inevitable following up of the action of our fathers seems to me to lead necessarily to our going with our College too, or else to my mind the whole movement was a mistake from which we must now retreat. Either in letting our students who are studying for the ministry go to the old universities to graduate we yielded to an amiable weakness from which we must try to recover, or else we have laid upon ourselves the solemn obligation to go with them, and so support and strengthem them when there--(hear, hear). We encourage our young ministers to go there, and we give them external exhibitions to enable them to go there. We many of us can remember when we came into College ourselves, how we came with the earnest but somewhat vague and ignorant resolve of young men, and how from year to year our College associations with the older students, associations with the Professors, and an increasing realisation of the work that we were doing and preparing for, deepened and widened our sense of consecration to the work which we had undertaken. Now we send our successors into the the keenest intellectual interests and excitement, into which, if they are doing their duty as students, they throw themselves without reserve, and we leave them entirely unbalanced by any kind of reminder of their connection with the work to which they have devoted themselves, except that they receive £50 a-year on the understanding that they are entering into the ministry ; many a one comes out of that well, but "Thou

shalt not make thy son or thy daughter to pass through fire." Let us go, then, and support them in these years of intellectual eagerness and keenness. Let them be supported by the fellowship of the Professors and the associations of the College which has to complete their special training for the work to which they have dedicated themselves. To get again to the material aspects, which is to me, I confess, a relief, let me try to remove, if I can, the wide impression which I have found current amongst my friends, that we are going to send young men into these colleges, and going to put them under circumstances which will be fatal to self-respect, by putting them into a society in which they will be expected to incur expenses, and in which the privileges which they desire to receive will only be open to them on condition of their incurring expenses which are entirely out of their reach. Now, in the first place, many of us as young men have had to associate, and have associated, with young men whose scale of living and expenditure was altogether greater than our own, and we have been obliged to feel that it must be something else than equal freedom with sovereigns, or even half-crowns or sixpences, something other than equal freedom with money that must win us a place of companionship at their sides; and there is no one of us who has gone through that but has come out stronger, with more manhood and self-respect—(hear, hear). There is, of course, a limit to that; but those who speak, as I have heard many of my friends speak, are ignorant, I am convinced, of the changes that have come over the University life during the last ten years. Mr. Odgers has already alluded to that, and I will be very brief; but I have heard the statements of persons of wide experience and careful observation, and I deliberately say that, as far as it seems possible to ascertain the conditions of University life at present, those whose parents or friends are willing to make such sacrifices for them as many a poor minister or minister's widow made in my day for myself and my fellow-students to enjoy the full privileges offered by this institution—those, I say, whose friends are willing to make an equivalent sacrifice for them, will find themselves in Oxford on at least an equivalent footing to that on which we stood here—(hear, hear). I have only one more point on which I desire to say a few words before I sit down. I see before me many Trustees who live in London, and to whom it was perhaps natural that the first thought suggested by the proposal to remove Manchester New College was one of various degrees of desolation of heart, as they thought of the work in which they were engaged, and of the personal relations of their own lives. Mr. Chairman, I have a right to speak on this matter—(hear, hear). I only beg every fellow London Trustee that is here to banish from his mind all personal considerations of what will be the effect as regards himself if this resolution is carried, but to act here simply and solely as a loyal Trustee of Manchester New College. One of the Trustees, and one who had announced his earnest desire that the College should stay in London, said to me yesterday morning, "I am hoping to get my way, but I shall throw myself as heartily as any man into the course adopted, and

do my utmost to make it successful, whatever that course may be.' We all of us feel strongly on this subject. Who that has any feelings can but feel strongly on it? Let us all determine, that whatsoever be the issue to-day we will, every one of us, go out from this meeting with a deepened sense of responsibility, with a deepened passion of loyalty towards the College which has such a noble though modest past, and for which we will strive with all our heart to secure an equally noble and worthy future—(cheers).

Professor Henry Morley

Asked leave to offer a word or two of explanation before any other resolution was proposed to the meeting. He did not rise to take part in the debate on one side or the other. He then gave certain details as to the history and life of University College, and justified its present position and aims.

The Chairman: I may remind you that time is valuable, and I am quite sure, whatever the policy of the trustees may be, that the little difficulties of detail which have been mentioned will be remedied. The great point which I hope we shall confine ourselves to is, what is the best place for the College, whether in the widest and best interest of the College we should go to Oxford or not. I trust that all subsequent speakers will endeavour, as far as possible, to confine themselves to the main point, and leave the details and smaller matters to be settled afterwards. It will conduce, of course, to the convenience of the meeting that everybody will keep that in mind. The resolution now has been moved and seconded. With regard to the voting, I believe there are some present who are subscribers, not voters. Those who have a right to vote as Trustees are those who subscribe two guineas or upwards, the gentlemen who received trusteeship as members of the late University Hall body, and ministers and other life Trustees under special regulations; so that those who do not come under these regulations, of course, will not vote.

Mr. W. P. Clayden.

Mr. Chairman, I came here with the determination not to make a speech, but I wish to correct one misapprehension, as it seems to me, under which this discussion has been conducted. Mr. Morley, in his speech, has removed, at any rate, one misapprehension conveyed by the speeches of the mover and seconder of this resolution. It occurs to me that there is another misapprehension which has run through their speeches, and which it struck me as very desirable we should remove on the very threshold of this discussion. I was much struck with what Mr. Wicksteed said about ringing the bell and running away; and he intimated, if there was any meaning in that illustration, that the not accepting the opening of the Universities was equivalent

to ringing the bell and running away. What I wish to remind this meeting of is that in the particular matter we are discussing here to-day the Universities have not been open to Nonconformists. That is the point I wish particularly to impress upon this meeting. We are seeking to send our theological students to the Universities, and it is in theology, and all theological matters, that the Universities still remain exactly what our ancestors have protested against for 200 years. Gentlemen, we have opened the Universities, so far as laymen are concerned. I am one of those who send their sons to the Universities. Therefore we are not ringing at the bell and running away. They have opened the Universities to laymen, we have sent our laymen's sons to take advantage of the Universities, and I ask this meeting whether it would be wise, before we send our theological students there, to wait till they open the door to theological students. It is a point of the utmost importance, as it seems to me. We are sending our theological students there in the midst of the old system, and we must not go into this discussion to-day with the misapprehension that the Universities are open. I do not rise to make a speech, but merely to make the one protest, lest the discussion should be carried on under that misapprehension—(cheers).

Mr. Darbishire.

Mr. Chairman, I had made up my mind that I would not speak to day, but I think it wise to remove a misapprehension which seems to have filled Mr. Clayden's mind, and it is this. When we are sending our Divinity students to Oxford we are not sending them to learn theology at Oxford. We are sending our own theologists there—(hear, hear)—our own ministers, our own spiritual influence there, to be on the spot ; and we are trying to redeem neglect and unfaithfulness. Both ministers and laymen of our body have sent their young men to Oxford, as they have sent their young men into the world, not of Oxford alone, but of London, without any care for their religious and godly training. We have to make up, gentlemen, for two generations of default and bitter neglect, and this we are trying to do—(hear, hear). It is this we are in earnest for, and for this that Mr. Beard and I have laboured for years to bring this movement before the College. While I am speaking of Mr. Beard, may I tell you one message? Mr. Beard, my co-secretary, and I were brothers in this College. Every matter relating to the College was turned over by us. Nine years ago, after attempting for three or four years to bring this question before the College Trustees effectually, a resolution came down to the Committee to consider the question of removal. At that meeting a special report was carried by the vote of the Chairman only, and Mr. Beard was requested to be the mouthpiece of the Committee and to bring it before the Trustees. I shall never forget the pain and disappointment with which my friend undertook that duty and discharged it. Those who were on that platform will recollect how pale and nervous he was, and after he had

done his duty with regard to that resolution, how he left the table and went into a corner and sat with his face between his hands, bitterly depressed—(hear, hear). Well, gentlemen, the last afternoon that I saw Mr. Beard he left the sofa where he lay to speak to me to go to the bed in which he scarcely spoke again. He called me to hear what he had to say, and he wished me to say that nothing in his life he had done affected him so sadly as that business. He said that if God gave him strength to write that night he would do it to help our cause. It pleased God not to give him strength, but he expressed his whole concurrence on this subject again and again. Mr. Beard's singular acquaintance with men, his singular sympathy with all the spiritual efforts of men, his singular insight into human nature, his large experience in business and in politics, the wonderful confidence which he received from ministers and men, especially from young men, gave him a power in speaking upon these matters, and in seeing what were the movements of the day, and where poor struggling men might be helped and led forward, that very few men indeed amongst us have, and make his judgment of the very greatest value.

Dr. W. Blake Odgers

Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose this motion, and I do so with some diffidence and with much reluctance. It is extremely difficult to rise and oppose the well-considered Report presented to this meeting by a committee for everyone of whom I have the greatest respect, many of whom are my own intimate friends, especially when the Report is recommended to the meeting by my own elder brother. Nor is the task in any way lightened when I have to rise after a speech such as that we have just heard from Mr. Darbishire, which must convey to everybody, whether opposing the moving of the College to Oxford or not, a profound sense of the great loss we have suffered by the death of Mr. Beard; and I can assure Mr. Darbishire I feel as much as he that great weight ought to be attached to such a message coming from Mr. Beard, and I also feel how much value and importance ought to be attached to Mr. Darbishire's own opinion on the subject—(hear, hear). It is perfectly true, as he says, that he has grown grey in the service of the College, and so have many others of this Committee. And yet, as I have some little acquaintance with the matters which have been discussed here, I feel it is my duty, younger as I am than most of the Committee, to come forward to-day and say that, having done as my minister asked me to do, and laid aside as far as I possibly could every personal consideration in this matter, and my deep sense of the loss which it will be to me as a Londoner if Manchester New College and its professors should be moved to Oxford, yet I do still feel it would be a false step and a wrong step if you move your theological college away from here to Oxford. First of all let us be quite clear as to the present state of things. If I may criticise my elder brother's speech, which is a rash thing to do, it appeared to me that much of his speech was addressed to the question

whether or not we ought to send our undergraduates to Oxford -- (hear, hear). Now I do not know how much you whom I am addressing know of the working of Manchester New College. Some of you may not be aware that at this moment, as arrangements stand, our students may and do go to Oxford, Cambridge, Glasgow, Aberdeen, and other Universities, and then, when they have taken their degrees at those institutions, they come here to have their three years' theological course. Of course, my brother naturally assumed that you know that ; but are you quite clear about it? As the thing stands at the present moment, students may be educated at one of the older Universities as external students of the Manchester New College ; they take their degrees there, and come up here after having had the full benefit of an Oxford career. Such of them as can afford it can under the existing system go to Oxford to join in the cricket and rowing, on which the Report lays stress. After having had their undergraduate course they come up here for three years' teaching in theology, and the question before you now is not whether our undergraduates are to be educated at Oxford, but whether or no our theological college is to be moved there with its establishment of professors and graduated students, whether the graduates are to have their theological training for the Unitarian ministry at Oxford or here in London. What are the reasons alleged for this change? The Report begins with a retrospect: Look at the reasons which brought Manchester New College up to London. In those days the young Dissenting laymen were here, now they have moved to Oxford and Cambridge, and theological students must, it is said, go after them --(hear, hear). That is the prevailing argument in the first part of the Report. Sir, to begin with, the mere fact that the reasons for bringing the College up to London may now seem to have ceased to exist is not alone a satisfactory reason for removing the College. For instance, one of the reasons put forward for the moving to Oxford is that Dr. Hatch and Dr. Cheyne lecture at Oxford, but you would not like me if ten years hence I came down to Oxford to say that Dr. Hatch is dead, and that Dr. Cheyne had ceased to lecture, and, therefore, you should bring the College back to London again. The mere fact that some of the reasons which induced the moving of the College up to London have ceased to exist is no reason for taking it away. Why was the College brought up? Because they thought that London was a better place for it than Manchester, and I think that reason still remains--(hear, hear). Another reason undoubtedly was--I will meet you as fairly as I possibly can—that at that time Dissenting students could come to University College, and nowhere else, whereas now the older Universities are open to them, and they flock there in large numbers. Some do still come to University College, though hardly any of them still come to University Hall. Our Unitarian laymen do not all go to Oxford. From the speeches which have been made as to the necessity of bolstering up the Unitarianism of young men at Oxford by having a College and a set of Professors behind them, you would think it was to Oxford only that

those young men went; but if that be really necessary you must create three or four Colleges, at Oxford, Cambridge, Aberdeen, and Glasgow. It would be far better to start a chapel with a resident minister in each of our older Universities. And how many young Unitarian laymen are there in Oxford? I should doubt very much whether you would find as many as twelve young Unitarian laymen resident at Oxford. I believe, myself, there are more at Cambridge than at Oxford. You have in your Hall a student who has been an undergraduate at Oxford, and who left after taking his degree to come and be trained as a minister here, and I said to him, "How many young Unitarian laymen did you get to know at Oxford?" and he said, "There were none at my College, but I did get to know two Unitarian laymen when I was there; there were two other Divinity students I knew, and there was another man at another College to whom I was introduced who had been a Hibbert scholar." That was his actual experience. Therefore, if you take your College down to Oxford for the sake of permitting the Divinity students to associate with lay Unitarians, you will fail. You will not secure the purpose at which you aim. You will find this to be the fact: if your undergraduate is in a College where there happens to be a Unitarian they will get to know one another; if there is no Unitarian in the College, he will not get to know Unitarians who are outside his College. It is very difficult to be intimate with men at other colleges. There were two or three Unitarians up at Cambridge in my time, but they never spoke to me. If your object is to get your young laymen to associate with your future divinity students you will not secure it by this scheme. The only way in which you could secure it would be to build a proper College where lay students and divinity students should live together under one roof; but that is not what is suggested in this Report. What is the suggestion in this Report? A building in which no one is to reside, just a lecture-room, a chapel, a room for the Professors to use, as a day-room and a students' common room. I submit that this is not a College at all. The thing that you are anxious to have there would not be recognised as a College at Oxford, and would not have the one advantage of having your laymen and Divinity students under the same roof, living together and seeing one another every day. The men are to live in other Colleges or in lodgings, anywhere. Then, what is the benefit proposed? You will have such of your men as choose to go to Oxford dotted about the various Colleges, and they will see very little of each other. I doubt whether they will see anything of the Unitarian laymen with whom the Report says they are to associate. Besides the Unitarian layman will go down at the end of the usual three years' course; he will very probably come up to London. But you will not let his theological friend accompany him; he must stay on at Oxford three years more! And I pity the student of Manchester New College whose parents could not afford to send him to Oxford as an undergraduate; he will never have any chance of forming intimate friendships with undergraduates at Balliol or Christ Church; he will be in Oxford but not of

it, an alien and an outsider. One of the arguments presented to us for removing the theological students is that men who have taken a degree at Oxford, Cambridge, London, or anywhere else, will find a staff of professors for theological student graduates down there, and it is said that they may attend the lectures of Dr. Hatch, Dr. Cheyne and Dr. Driver. The Report goes on to remark, in the passage corrected as to one of the Professors this morning, that those lectures are practically unattended, except by the students of Mansfield College. I do not see that that proves they are worthless; I regard it as proving their extreme value—(laughter). From what I know of the prevailing tone among undergraduates the value of those lectures would be in inverse proportion to the attendance of your undergraduates. I cannot share in the high admiration of Oxford which my brother expresses. It is true there are there two or three men of great distinction who are really liberal in religious matters, but they are the exceptions which prove the rule; the few Oxford men who are not ignorantly orthodox, who have thought at all on religious matters, are ardent Positivists. The existing religious atmosphere at Oxford is decidedly unhealthy, and yet you propose to plunge our students into it. As to saying that Oxford as a whole has ceased to be exclusive and Anglican I deny it—(hear, hear). I should say that Oxford, as a whole, would regard Manchester New College as an offensive intrusion into their select circle. Another thing to be remembered regarding these doctors is that Dr. Hatch himself has been lecturing in London very recently. The Hibbert Trustees brought him up, and the students of Manchester New College could have attended his lectures here in London. The Hibbert Trustees, after reading this Report, may go further and also bring up Dr. Cheyne. But apart from this, are you going to move your College there, whatever admirable lectures there may be, merely in order that the students might attend these lectures by three doctors of the creed-bound Church? If there is anything of permanent value in these lectures they will be printed and published, and the books can be read by students hereafter. Granting the fact that some of the men do sometimes come to London and lecture here, granting the fact that their lectures are sure, if having much value in them, to be published and printed so as to be read, it is a small argument to say we will take our theological students down there to hear these lectures by these men. What other argument is there for taking the theological part of our College down there? It is said that Mansfield College is a great success. I do not see that the Report says that, but it says the Mansfield College students have been welcomed by the professors. Dr. Driver or Dr. Hatch does not know those men as students of Mansfield College, but as Jones of Lincoln or Brown of Balliol. So if our students went the professor would not recognise them as students of Manchester New College. Under this new scheme that ancient institution would not even be a licensed boarding-house. As to Mansfield College, that Dr. Fairbairn has met with success I admit. Dr. Fair-

bairn has won his way in a wonderful manner among the Oxford men ; that is true. But did you hear what they did with him ? They made him a member of some other College ; they would not accept him as a professor of Mansfield College. Their form of recognition is to connect him with one of the other Colleges. As to the other gentleman, he had been made a Master of Arts of Corpus. That was their way of recognising the Professors of Mansfield College. That our Professors would assuredly win their way I do not deny for one moment. Whether they would care to accept a degree coupled with such restrictions I do not know. I think myself that Dr. Drummond would prefer to keep the degree he has from Edinburgh, and that Professor Upton and Professor Carpenter would prefer to remain Master of Arts of the University of London. But, Sir, leaving alone the fact that the two Principals of Mansfield College have been well received, I say that the College has not been a success in the sense that this residence in Oxford has done it any good ; it has carried on exactly the same work in Oxford that it would have carried on at Bradford, had it remained there. With the exception of the two Principals having won their way into Oxford society, Mansfield College remains wholly unrecognised, and is simply unknown to the University of Oxford. And so it would be with Manchester New College. Now comes another portion of the question. It is said your finances may suffer here in London ; Professor Morley dealt with this matter to some extent. It has been said frequently that residence in Manchester New College is causing financial ruin and disaster to the College ; the Report does not say so, but I was told last night that the College is expending its capital in bolstering up University Hall. It is not true ; the Committee do not say so in their Report.

Mr. DARBISHIRE : It is certainly true.

Dr. BLAKE ODGERS : Just listen to what the Committee said less than two years ago. I have before me the Report for 1887, which says :—"Turning to University Hall the Committee can speak with satisfaction of the financial position which has been at length attained. During the year just concluded the Hall accounts show a profit of £191 6s. 10d., after paying interest at five per cent. on capital advances. Unfortunately, in the three previous years there had been a deficit of £156 15s. 6d., so that the net profit on the four years' working is only £34 11s. 4d. The financial position is the more sound, however, in that the term fees in the current session, which has opened since the conclusion of the financial year, have again been raised from two to three guineas, so that adds a further £170 to the prospective residential receipts. There is no question about the success of the experiment. Much has been due to the personality of Professor Morley, and much is owing to him for his indefatigable labours ; but it is clear that there is now a steady demand for a Hall of Residence associated with University College." At that time they called it a "hall of residence" for students of University College, now they called it a lodging-house. It is a fact that on the accounts as presented they show that for the five years'

previous working they had paid 5 per cent. on the capital advanced, and have now got £146 to the good, in addition to the 5 per cent.; but, as my friend Mr. Wicksteed says, there is nothing written off on account of repairs. I am speaking of these matters hurriedly, not having been able to look them up. I think what took place was this. In 1885 £106 was expended in repairs and renewals; that was added to the capital sum, on which 5 per cent. interest is charged; and the next year 5 per cent. is charged not only upon the amount that had been laid out in building and furnishing, but also on the outlay for the repairs. Going on further, I find that over £288 was expended in repairs and renewals in the year ending Sept. 29, 1881, and in another year there also another sum of £238. These repairs and renewals are going on from time to time, and this amount is added to the capital sum advanced, and the Hall has paid on its working 5 per cent. on the total sum, and we still have £146 in hand. I do say on these figures it does not appear we are in any financial difficulties here in London. But what if we go to Oxford? No doubt there must be a very considerable outlay. I think anybody will admit that. I suppose the Committee have got some idea what the total outlay will be, but they do not tell us in the report. I apprehend, even if the land be given to you, there will be an expenditure of from £20,000 to £30,000 before the buildings are erected. The Report goes on to say: "There would be an undoubted saving in the annual expenditure of the College after its settlement at Oxford, as compared with the cost at present." (Voices: "Question," "Put away side issues.") The Report is before us. The Report asserts that if you go to Oxford you will save on your annual expenditure. I deny that, and I want to show why. These are the words of the Report:—"There would undoubtedly be a saving in the annual expenditure of the College, after its settlement at Oxford, as compared with the cost at present." The cost of an under-graduate student here is, on the average, £100. Seventy-five pounds is to be the most allowed in future. No one who goes to Oxford, either as a resident or non-resident student, can possibly live on that. What the Report says is this: If we go to Oxford, once we are settled there, the cost which this scheme contemplates will be less than the cost we have had actually to pay in London. I say that is a fallacious argument. Suppose I said to my wife, "Let us remove from Hampstead to Kensington; it will cost £200 or £300 to remove; but when we are settled down at Kensington we only propose to spend £300 a-year, whereas at Hampstead we spend £500." Do you not think that astute house-keeper would say, "Why cannot we stop here at Hampstead, and spend only £300?" If you can keep your undergraduates for £75 at Oxford, why do not you do it here? I claim to speak with some slight authority. I believe I am the only man in the room who has spent two years in University Hall, and afterwards been to one of the larger Universities to reside as an undergraduate. At University Hall I was bound to be as economical as possible, as my father was a poor man, and when I went to Cambridge I was equally bound to be

as economical as I could ; but do what I could my expenses at Cambridge were certainly £20 a-year greater than they were when I lived in this Hall. You may possibly say that you will not send your undergraduates into Colleges at Cambridge, but that they could reside in lodgings outside. I do not know that that would make a difference in the cost ; but if they live away from the College, if they are non-collegiate students, they get none of the social advantages of the College, and none of the benefits of intercourse with laymen, which, according to the Report, are such important things. They might possibly be able to get along with about £100 a-year ; but if you send your young men into a College to live there with his fellow-undergraduates, to take a position not conspicuously mean, certainly £120 is to my mind too little. They must each spend from £140 to £150 in order to enable them to do it at all—(hear, hear). Hence it is clear that if you are going to pay for your students when they get to Oxford, your annual expenditure must be increased by the change. According to this Report you even find it necessary now to give your students pocket-money—to which I most strongly object. To take the students entirely off their parents' hands is a very bad and mischievous thing, if I may say so—(hear, hear). Now let us take the undergraduates you will have in the year 1898. Either their parents will have means to keep them without receiving so large a sum from the College, or they will not. If their parents can afford to pay anything for them, well and good : let their parents afford it whether they are here or at Oxford. If they cannot, you will have to pay the whole expense of residence at Oxford, which will be greater than the whole expense of residence here, and there cannot be any saving in the annual expenditure of the College when once you move down there. One more observation, and I sit down. There have been several things put forward about Oxford being the seat of the highest intellectual life, and so on. I will not go into that again. The thing we have to consider is, in which place will our future ministers receive the very best education ? I say unhesitatingly in London. At Oxford there will be not a single Sunday-school in which they will be permitted to teach ; at Oxford there will be no possibility of their joining in mission work. They will have no opportunities for anything of that sort. They will have no practical training whatever for the ministry. They will not even know a single lady except the wives and daughters of their professors. I spoke to one lady the whole time I was at Cambridge—(laughter). That was the wife of my college master. There will be no possibility for students at Oxford to acquire any of that practical training which ministers ought to have. It is said in the Report that that may be done afterwards, and that the students might go for a year to a large congregation under some active minister. That appears to me to be begging the whole question. This College exists, and we subscribe to it, in order that it may educate young men and give them the most efficient and valuable training in everything that will be necessary, so that when they leave

this College they may be fit to take a congregation. I object to have that duty thrown upon a large congregation with an active minister. It might be very rough on the congregation, and it would probably be so on the minister. The training of our future ministers is a matter which affects the Unitarian body as a whole; and speaking with such experience as I have of residence in University Hall, I say that here in London is the right place in which to train your ministers, and that here in London is the right place to keep your College. The Report speaks of the duty of holding up "in the ancient home of dogmatism the standard of a scientific and fearless search for Truth in Theology;" but I say that here in London, amid the busy hum of men, and not in an academic cloister, is the right place to plant that standard; here is the right place to carry on your search for truth, and here is the best place in which your students can obtain their training for their future profession—(applause).

The Rev. H. E. Dowson.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to be allowed to say a few words in defence of this Report, in answer to the speech made by my friend Dr. Odgers, who, I am quite sure you will agree with me, does not seem very much afraid of his elder brother—(laughter). I will say one word at the commencement of the financial question, although the Committee have not based their policy on the financial question, but on a far larger basis. No doubt, sir, we expect to ask for a great deal of money if we go to Oxford, and we believe that it is a policy to arouse the enthusiasm of our people, and that the money will be found—(applause). We shall want much more capital to go to Oxford than we can possibly risk at University Hall. I admit it. Then with regard to this question of depreciation, no doubt we owe a great deal to the Crabb-Robinson trustees in reference to this building, and we have received many benefits from them for which we are deeply grateful. I should like to ask the legal mind of Dr. Odgers whether these gifts of the Crabb-Robinson Trustees are an addition to the capital of Manchester College? If so, I should be delighted to hear it. Dr. Odgers has pointed out that a large part of the renewals have been paid for year by year out of capital, and added to the capital sum on which we pay five per cent. Is not that a proof that we do not pay all these renewals out of income, but that they increase the debt of the University Hall management to Manchester New College? I think, Sir, that is a distinct proof that we are increasing the indebtedness of University Hall to Manchester New College year by year. Now, Sir, with regard to the question of the cost of our students respectively in London and at Oxford, if we go there. Why is it that we pay these £20 bursaries? It is because we have enforced residence in University Hall, and we have given young men Exhibitions in kind. We do not give a single farthing in money; but in some cases it has been necessary, I greatly regret it, in order to enforce residence, to give these £20 grants. In connection with the new

scheme there will be no enforced residence. Our students will be able to go to Oxford, to go to Cambridge, or to remain in London, and study at University College, or to go where they please, and there will be different Exhibitions, according to the place at which they study. We do not feel as a Committee—I do not know whether the Trustees agree with me—that we have been doing right in taking the entire responsibility of the education of the students upon ourselves : and our policy if we go to Oxford will be to expect young men to sacrifice a good deal themselves, in order to get their education ; and I believe, sir, from evidence I received the other day at Oxford from Dr. Fairbairn that £70 a year is a sum on which the undergraduates can live in lodgings as College students. He stated so clearly : and I agree also with my friend Mr. Wicksteed that to have to fight the battle of life even rather hardly is not a bad training for a future minister of religion—(hear, hear). I do not argue at all on the financial question. I should not be in favour of leaving University Hall on any financial ground ; it is only for the great policy of going to Oxford. I should like to be allowed to recite some of the arguments contained in the Report, and in doing so to deal with the objections of Dr. Odgers. I ask the Trustees to go back in memory to the time when Manchester College was at work in the days when Dr. Martineau and Mr. Gaskell were fellow-students with men like John Taylor, Edward Enfield, and Alfred Paget. Those men were imbued by the spirit of our College, and to them we owe much. We hold up the standard of free teaching and learning in theology ; and they laid the foundation of allegiance to that spirit in everyone of our churches in the land. At the old York College friendships were formed which lasted to the dying days of the students. I have heard again and again a gentleman, whom I honour and revere more than I can tell, speak of the old association in the old days at York College. There is nothing like those early attachments at college and at school ; they never die out. I own that the best influence I have enjoyed in my life has been due to those early friendships. See how an old Rugbeian cottons to an old Rugbeian wherever they meet ! They may never have met at the school, but the simple fact that they have been reared in the same grand school brings them heart and soul together. I was a Hovite in the days of Mr. Malleson, and throughout the length and breadth of England when old Hovites meet we grasp hands and say, "Don't you remember, don't you remember?" The old days live again, and we are friends. I think this was the case at York, and when the College was moved from Manchester to York, friendships were formed of which we have had so touching an illustration in the noble speech of my colleague to-day. Then we went to London to University Hall, and the same thing was true again. As has been said again and again, University College was the one place of free education, and University Hall was founded in 1849 to provide a home for our young laymen who came from all parts of England to study at University College. Manchester New College in 1853 followed the young laymen up to London, and it was right

that Manchester New College should come to London to bring the young laymen and the young ministers once again side by side in the same College. Now, Sir, I speak of what I know when I refer to the life of University Hall thirty years ago. I lived here six years, and there is not a man in this Hall to-day that loves University Hall more than I do. Some of the dearest friendships of my life were formed in it. I made friends with a Darbishire, with a Greg, a Taylor, a Cobb, an Ely, a Carpenter, a Kitson, a Kenrick, a Talbot, a Parker, a Beale, a Harrop—men representing the best life of our Churches in England. All of those men were my College friends and associates in this Hall, and therefore it is dear to my memory, and I owe it allegiance. To me it has been all through my life a wonderful help and support. I have gone a great deal about the country doing my work and in every large town in the land I have had friends to greet me and invite me to their homes. It has helped me to do the little work I have done for our churches; and when I was called away from this College to settle in Birmingham, I believe the reason I was called there was because I had made friends here with young men belonging to the congregation of Birmingham, and if I ever got the least hold on the congregation, it was largely from the feeling of fellowship between me and them. I am sure there are many men who will bear the same testimony to the infinite value of those earlier attachments. We cannot make them later on in life as we did in those young days. That was the state of things thirty years ago; but that has absolutely and entirely come to an end. The old *régime* of University Hall died a natural death, because the times are completely changed. Mr. James Heywood and others, to whom we owe much, and whose names are dear to us, fought for the opening of the old Universities; and they have been successful, and so our laymen have gone away. It is the only legitimate issue. They claim their place in the young life of the nation. This Hall was given to Manchester New College, and we are exceedingly grateful for the gift. Manchester New College took it in hand, and we had to try an experiment for a term of years. We tried it, and, as has been said, I think we proved it unsatisfactory. Some of us have done our utmost to make the experiment a success—(hear, hear). One of the greatest causes of congratulation in that trial was that we had Professor Morley as our Principal. His genial spirit, his trust in human nature, won the hearts of the young men in this hall—(applause)—and his influence year by year has filled it to overflowing. We furnished and we made it attractive. In regard to this furniture, it is true that if the old furniture should be sold it would fetch nothing like the price at which it was bought after it had been used year after year by students. I remember when I was in the Hall the furniture depreciated—(laughter). I do not suppose I am the only man in this Hall who in his life has smashed chairs. One of the hopes with which the Manchester New College Committee undertook the management of this Hall, under the principalship of Professor Morley, one of the leading laymen of the Church, was that we might

bring back some of the young laymen of those churches. I think I am right in saying that in the six years we have now been responsible for the management, only four young laymen belonging to our churches have been enrolled as students in this Hall. I think I do not make a mistake in saying that three of those have belonged to one family ; so that we have utterly failed to induce the parents to send their sons to University Hall. It has been full of excellent gentlemen, medical and engineering students, Indian civilians, Negroes, Parsees, and a number of gentlemen for whom I have the greatest respect ; but those are not the young laymen of our own churches, and consequently the early associations between our young ministers and young laymen have not existed here during those six years. The young laymen are at the old Universities, and I think it is quite right that they are there, and the young ministers have remained in London. Now Sir, I hope that we follow the tradition, not only of Manchester New College, but of the founders of this Hall, in claiming our place at the old Universities, and taking there the young ministers in succession to the young laymen who have already gone. To my mind, Sir, it is doing business on antiquated lines to go on the old system here working for a market that has no existence. I think that something has been done already. We have established our external scholarships, and many of our young men have gone to Oxford and Cambridge. I admit all that Dr. Odgers has said upon that point ; but I hold that there has been great danger in allowing our young laymen and our external undergraduates of this College to go to Oxford and Cambridge uncared for and untended ; and that is my strongest plea for the cause in which I am interested. I lament beyond measure the manner in which in all our congregations in the land we are losing the young men who ought to be the hope of our future—(hear, hear). Although we may win more of the populace, the future of our Church will not be what it might have been had the descendants of the founders of this grand old Hall been members working and living in our churches and carrying along our banner—(hear, hear). I attribute that, Sir, to a very considerable extent—I know there are other reasons —to the fact that our young men from our best families go to a public school for years and go to a University for some years afterwards, and they are altogether beyond the range of the influence of our churches. They become unattached during the long period of their education, and it is hard to win them back again. Now I say, "follow them yourselves, keep them. They are the hope of your future. Do not lose them." Therefore it is no answer to me to say that our external scholars get all the advantages of Oxford and Cambridge. They get the educational advantages, they may get the privilege which I wish I had enjoyed when I was young, of pulling in the 'Varsity boat. I was brought up on a Norfolk river, and I wished very much that I could get into the 'Varsity boat, and to my mind I might have been a better man had I done so. But we want something better than that, and we want the young men of our churches to be faithful to the noble tradition of Manchester New College, and to the principles for which it works. I

may have too much faith, but I do sincerely hope to live to see Dr. Drummond, Professor Carpenter, and Professor Upton placed at Oxford, speaking or preaching in a College chapel in a manner which appeals to the feeling of undergraduates, Sunday after Sunday ; and if the best men of our faith speak in the chapel, I believe they may touch the hearts of some of those lay undergraduates ; I believe that we may win them not only to our principles, but may draw them into our ministry. I do not like to take up the time of the meeting with my private confessions, but I may say what it was that drew me into the ministry and brought me to Manchester New College. It was the Rev. John James Tayler, going down to Norwich when I was a corn merchant. It was then that I heard that sainted man speak ; his voice thrilled through my nature ; I came to Manchester New College, and I have to thank his influence for it. Now, Sir, we hope that many young laymen studying at Colleges in Oxford may be touched by Dr. Drummond, Professor Carpenter, or Professor Upton, and be brought into the ranks of our ministry, who otherwise never would have been in it. I have faith in that, Sir ; I believe it—(hear, hear). Then, Sir, in regard to the associations at Oxford, it is said our young ministers and our young laymen, during their undergraduate course, would be scattered among the various colleges. I know something about Rugby School, and I know that at Rugby School for some time Lee Warner's house was, in a sense, the Unitarian house to which our boys felt most inclined to go, and they went there and formed friendships which last to-day. I think I am not far wrong in saying that Trinity College, Cambridge, attracts the larger part of our young men, and at Oxford our young men might be attracted to Balliol. We know that half the undergradutes at Balliol live in licensed lodging-houses outside, at an expense within reach of our external scholars, and I should not be surprised if Balliol became the College in which our young laymen as well as our young ministers might get into the habit of meeting. I believe that the presence of Manchester New College at Oxford would induce many of our parents to send their sons to Oxford. I hope to see some of my sons at Oxford, if Manchester College goes there. A boy with the noble influence of this college around him will be helped to keep true to our ancient faith. I believe with all my heart and soul in this cause, in its influence on our old churches, and on our old traditional life. I have one more word to say. I do believe also it is our duty, whether we are asked or not, to speak our word, where the young life of the nation is constantly to be met. Here in London we are lost—(cries of "No"). I have the greatest sympathy for those who will be sorry to lose this College ; I feel for them exceedingly ; but what I mean is that we are, as an influence on the life of the nation, lost in London—(hear, hear, and "No"). I say we are, in London, like a drop in the great ocean, but at Oxford we should be like a living stream pouring itself into the head waters of young English life, and we should purify it ; ay, we should have a tremendous influence, if we were true, on the life of the nation. The time has come, Sir,

when we must be content with nothing less. It is for that I plead; and I should rejoice throughout my life if I do not plead in vain, and if this battle is won; but I should feel it an eternal honour to have pleaded in this cause even if the battle is lost—(cheers).

Mr I. S. Lister.

Mr. Chairman and fellow Trustees, I should be glad to say a few words on this Report as to how it strikes an outsider, one not on the Committee. I should like to make one remark on the speech of my friend who has just sat down. Our business instincts are appealed to by the Report; we are asked to sanction the spending of a good deal of money. We are not told how much; there is no statement, nothing of the sort given us. That is, as the present Chancellor of the Exchequer said, like being asked to give a blank cheque to be honoured by we know not whom. It strikes me as being a very unbusiness-like proceeding, and it is one I should feel most reluctant to sanction. The Report seems to me to be an address on one side of the question, rather than a Report dealing with the facts, and I should have liked it better if there were fewer adjectives in it, and if the Report had said, we have examined such and such witnesses, and their opinion is so and so, and we have examined other witnesses who think somewhat differently upon the matter, but on the whole we think as follows. But we are told nothing of the sort. If we turn to page 14 we find a paragraph which states—"The Professors themselves would feel the advantage of this most strongly." We are not told they ever said so. It does not even say that they would feel it. It means that in the opinion of the Committee they ought to feel it most strongly. Then we have a good deal of what we must call (I do not wish to say so disrespectfully) begging the question. We have, for instance, on page 15 the following:—"If the enthusiasm that a noble and inspiring cause alone can arouse were once awakened." Then we have further on:—"It may be that the outlay of a larger capital may be needed at Oxford than any risked in London; but it will be laid out in a great cause and in the promotion of the highest interests of the College, and not in a doubtful commercial undertaking." In a Report, which I suppose is intended to deal with facts, that seems to be a rather curious thing to say. It is to my mind a speech or address on one side of the question—(hear, hear). I think the Professors will agree with me when I say that it is in immense advantage to the student to have an opportunity of having pastoral work while there—such as working in Sunday-schools, preaching, and conducting services at mission stations, for which there is certainly—I can speak with, perhaps, some knowledge on that point—plenty of opportunity in this great metropolis, but from what Dr. Blake Odgers has informed us there is no chance at all of this in Oxford.

Dr. Martineau.

I do not know, Sir, that I should have asked permission to say a few words on this subject had I not been requested by a friend to read a letter explaining why he was unable to be here to-day. I have been very anxious on this subject for a long time, and have had my moments of wavering and difficulty about it. Of late I have taken considerable pains to ascertain the actual effect of the working of the Colleges at Oxford upon the students of our connection who are educated there; and during my visit to Oxford last week I also took pains to ascertain facts and to gain impressions respecting the practical working of the experiment now being tried by the Congregationalists by the removal of Mansfield College. In thinking over the friends who had had experience in the education of their sons there, it occurred to me that my friend Mr. William Rathbone had two sons there, and I thought I could not have a more impartial opinion than that furnished by his experience. I called upon him, and found that the subject of this Report was new to him, but he took great interest in it, and he requested me to stop whilst he read the Report and thought it over; and he then gave me his opinion. His opinion was unfavourable to the proposal to remove to Oxford, and I requested him to come and express it here to-day, but he explained to me it was impossible. At the same time he had so decided an opinion upon it that he was unwilling to keep back that opinion, and requested me to present a letter from him, stating briefly the result of his own experience. That letter, with your permission, I will now read:—

Dear Dr. Martineau,—I am sorry that I cannot attend the meeting to-morrow in accordance with your wish, as I have to be at the House of Commons punctually at twelve o'clock, on a committee on which I have to move the first amendment that comes up.

I must say that I should agree with you in viewing with very great doubt, not to say dismay, the removal of "Manchester New College" to Oxford.

The great danger in our Churches seems to me the decay of the Puritan spirit and Puritan vigour, and certainly, as far as I know anything of Oxford, it is the last place I should go to, to guard against that danger. Having so many sons, I have naturally been led to watch these matters; and it appears to me, whether as regards physical, mental, or religious vigour, the atmosphere of Oxford is perhaps the least invigorating of any of our Universities. It is a place the climate of which is lowering, and I fancy it is only by very high feeding that men keep themselves in health for eight months in the year; and both the religious and intellectual tone of thought has seemed to me of late years to be anything but practical and vigorous.

The state of mind of the ordinary Oxford man seems to be about almost all questions, however important and essential:—"Well, it is possible it may be so—or, it is possible it may not be so; but it does not much matter which."

Now, that is not the tone of thought to make practical, vigorous men, such as we want among our ministers.

There is another and most important point which I hardly think

the Committee can have considered, and that is the exceedingly luxurious tendency of the Oxford mode of life. Men live at a college at Oxford with a degree of luxury which even the wealthier part of the community rarely can carry on. And against the advantages on which the Committee lay such stress—namely, the friendships formed at Oxford—you have to consider what seems to be the far more serious and dangerous disadvantage of the influence of what one of our head masters called "a multitude of otiose plutocrats, and aristocrats," and the great tendency which our old colleges have of fostering habits of self-indulgence and of extravagance, involving often the poorer students in debt, which hang round their neck for the rest of their lives.

Unless I had very strong confidence in a man, I would not send a poor man or even a moderately rich man to Oxford, for it would require a more than average amount of self denial and self-control to carry him safely through.

I put it to those who know Oxford more accurately than I do is not Oxford now very much divided between a few ascetics of the High Church School and a large proportion of those who live more luxuriously than they can expect to be able to carry on in after life?

Cambridge is more vigorous than Oxford, but I cannot help thinking that our Northern Colleges, and still more perhaps the Scotch Universities, are much more vigorous in their tone of feeling and thought, and much more likely to produce in our ministers men who will exercise an invigorating effect on the moral, mental, and religious fibre of those whom they are to teach.

I confess, therefore, that as far as I am competent to form an opinion in the matter, I agree with you that the change proposed would not be in the interests of the ministers themselves, or of their power for the spread of Free Christianity.

18, Prince's-gardens, London, S.W., June 27. W. RATHBONE.

I have to say but little upon the subject that has been discussed, and intend to avoid repetition as much as I can; but I am very strongly impressed with respect to a remark made by Dr. Blake Odgers on the fusion—or rather the intermixture—of the two views of the subject which have cropped up in the course of this discussion—I mean the discussion about the undergraduates and the communication between them and the undergraduate ministers, the undergraduate element on the one hand, and the other question about the removal of the past graduates—that is to say, of the Divinity school—to Oxford. Now, as I understand it, the grant for external scholarships has already settled the question with reference to the undergraduates. They can now, or at any time, go to Oxford or to Cambridge, as they go to Aberdeen, or anywhere else. By the present system the Committee have thought proper to relinquish the undergraduate education, and simply to give an Exhibition, enabling the student to follow his studies, and take his degree wheresoever may be most convenient to him. If that is done what is the use of bringing forward arguments about the decline of University College? Even if University College did not exist, if it were swallowed up by an earthquake, the college system would go on exactly as it is now by the grant of these external scholarships. Therefore the comparative merits of University Hall and of other places of education do seem to me to be absolutely foreign

to the whole subject of this discussion, and simply intruded upon it with very confusing effect. If I were to make a remark about that subject it would be this: That what we have to vote upon to-day is whether in consideration of the Divinity scholars going to Oxford, it would be advisable to increase the grant to undergraduate students, in order to induce them to study in Oxford in preference to any other University? So far no doubt our vote to-day does concern the undergraduates. I was at Oxford last week, and I took some pains to ascertain, from three different quarters, the impression about the removal of the Nonconformist College to Oxford, and also about the actual effect of the College among Nonconformist students at present in the University. Well, I found from three or four students whom I selected as most likely to know, there was not one of them who had the least acquaintance either with a Unitarian family, or with any Unitarian laymen, and they were in different Colleges. When I asked one what the effect would be of an accession of a number of Unitarian lay students in the Colleges, whether the young ministers would be drawn together in those tender and intimate friendships to which Mr. Dowson has so powerfully alluded to, his answer was, "It would depend in what College he was; we never form intimate friendships except with men of our own College." That is what he said. When I compare that with the friendships to which Mr. Dowson has alluded here, and which he seems now to put in comparison with Oxford and Cambridge, I ask, how many friendships can he now enumerate which he formed whilst he was in this very building, which is now put aside as antiquated? It seems to be true, therefore, that the removal of the Divinity part of the College to Oxford will not throw those students together within the same building at all. They will have no relation; the students would be residing in several distinct places, the older students would be scattered about in those colleges, or provided with lodgings, and would stand in no relation to them at all. However, I may say this, I would ask any one whether he thinks that our friend Mr. Dowson, placed wherever he might be, could fail to make friends owing to his genial and kindly nature—(hear, hear). He referred to his extremely romantic experience in York and Manchester. I suppose I am the only person present who can testify as to what York College was, and who could say very much even with respect to the Manchester College. It is true that the students at the time I have mentioned were fellow-students, and that they were all of them friends of mine, but there is not one of them whom I have mentioned who was not a relation of mine—(laughter). The Taylers were my cousins, and so in the same manner Edwin Enfield was indirectly a relative. At all events, his family were intimate friends of my own from the earliest time, and those friendships were not due in the least to those other ties he referred to. Moreover, I venture to say that no feature was more striking than the association of Divinity students exclusively with Divinity students, and lay students with laymen. Unless there was something to unite them by those relationships, I

cannot remember a single instance among my own fellow-students in which this bond existed. The Divinity students were looked down upon by the laymen. The laymen were plutocrats, and came from our wealthy families, whilst, on the other hand, the Divinity students were for the most part from families of humbler origin. They never joined together. I had formed a capital boating club, but it was impossible to get any but the Divinity students to join. Therefore the statements which have been made as to the close relations between young ministers and young laymen are incorrect. For the most part, at Oxford the young lay students are not particularly anxious to cultivate an acquaintance with young Divinity students. I questioned Dr. Fairbairn about the subject, and he completely confirmed that view. I first of all sought the opinion of some of the graduate students who were remaining at Oxford with a view to an academical career, and who were, therefore, permanent residents at Oxford. I think there could not be any doubt about their testimony, as they were fresh from student life, and they had just entered into the maturer academic life of Oxford. I especially consulted one who is a relative of Mr. Brown. He is a Churchman, not a Unitarian; but I asked if he had taken any interest in the work of Mansfield College, and what he thought about the permanent result of the establishment of a body of learned, well-cultivated Nonconformist students in a college within the town. He said, "They will stand in no relation to the University, and they will form no friendships in the University; they would be certainly looked upon with a degree of shyness, not through pride or hauteur, but because their career is a special career, with which young laymen have no great sympathy, and they will not be sought out by them. If they have strong personal qualities that will bring them forward; but as a whole, and speaking of the average working of the class of men, there is no reason at all to believe that they will have any more notice than other residents in the city of Oxford, and they would be without any kind of academical recognition." I think that is striking testimony. Next I made inquiries of certain heads of colleges, several of whom talked the question over with me. They all bore their testimony to the position which Dr. Fairbairn has made for himself. They said, "He is a very powerful man; he speaks powerfully and preaches powerfully, and a lecture given upon a neutral subject, not theology, would be listened to with interest in any hall or non-collegiate building in which he chose to give it. But if he preached in the College chapel at Mansfield he would probably not have any attraction for more than one or two of the regular academical students." I then determined to speak to Dr. Fairbairn, but he communicated with me first. I was staying with the Master of Balliol and he called upon me, and requested an opportunity of having some conversation with me. He was asked to come in the evening, and I had a long talk with him on the subject. I do not like to say anything which seems to contradict what I have heard in letters and speeches to-day, but I must say that what he said to me was entirely

at variance with the report Dr. Crosskey gives of another conversation, and when I remember that he sought me in order to talk over this very scheme that we are discussing to-day, I think that whatever he said ought to have considerable weight. He said, "My feeling about this proposal is, that if you will let us alone for ten years to try this experiment in Oxford, undisturbed by any recognition, I should have very considerable hope of its winning a permanent success. Although these hopes are encouraging it is a very precarious experiment, exposed to many dangers and difficulties, requiring to be carried on with great tact, and with no disturbance of public feeling. If, on the other hand, another religious body were to repeat the experiment, not only would it be extremely dangerous to us, but I do not hesitate to say that it would be fatal perhaps to them." I think that a very striking statement, and when mentioned afterwards to my friend the Master of Balliol, and one or two others, I found the feeling was very much the same. There are two ways in which the imperfect freedom of the existing Universities may be completed. I venture to remind you, in face of the repeated statements to-day that our Universities are open that there is a very serious limit to that opening. When I was a young man I had a most passionate desire to have a University education Then the Nonconformists were excluded, and I could not go. Now, if you ask me what it was that excluded the Nonconformists in their own sight, I say it was not the impossibility of getting a degree—it was the necessity every day to attend the chapels and the services. That was the thing that pressed upon the conscience of the Noncon formists, and to that they never could consent to expose their sons. At Oxford you could not go in without signing the articles; but Cambridge was open up to the time of taking the degree, and we know our friends Mr. James Heywood and Mr. Henry Bright went and took their course in Cambridge up to the time of taking their degree, and then, refusing to sign the articles, were content to forego the degree. It must have been the case with all of us. We might have had the education, which would have been the cream of the whole thing. The decoration of Fellow that is stuck on at the end was comparatively little compared with the education. But that was never regarded as a thing that could be conscientiously done. I must say I cannot express the depth of my astonishment when I find that feeling of repugnance as to the necessity of going daily to worship to which you cannot give a veracious, conscientious, and hearty assent, is dying away from us. Then my friend James Heywood said—"Why, those services were quite ridiculous—we only gabbled over them and got them over in ten minutes, and soon got out again." Taking the period of susceptible impression among young men, I will ask whether the repetition of that is or is not corrupting to the conscience?—(hear, hear). One of two things must take place; either the service of prayer, the most solemn act of human life, must be degraded to a mere recital of gabbled words without meaning, in which case the heart and mind are completely closed, and the conscience is shut up as to the truth of what is said; or else, on the other

hand, there must be a protest and objection in every act; and which ever of these things take place, I say it has the deepest influence upon the human mind. It is said that if you choose you may gain exemption from prayer, but every one who knows anything about Oxford knows you would then be a marked man. Moreover, among cultured students it is an action of the religious part of life; and a Nonconformist, therefore, would be a person who abolishes this religious part of life. I must say that is a most unsatisfactory state of things, and I have been very much surprised at the facility with which these scruples are set aside. I cannot agree, therefore, with what Mr. Dowson has said, and say that we have done the right thing with our laity, and that we must repeat that right thing with our ministers. To bring up ministers with this liability appears to me to be sapping the source of their spiritual life at the outset. That is by the way. What I was going to speak about is the feeling in Oxford respecting the other liberation that has yet to be fulfilled, namely, admission to free Divinity schools. That is the object which has to be attained, and the question is simply this. You may have relief from that disability in either of two ways. You may recognise the disability in the Divinity schools at Oxford as a permanent fact crystallised, stereotyped, and fixed, which you may never expect to be removed, and therefore seek permission to go and establish another school of theology different from the other, and each denomination would establish another and another and another, so as to surround this University with a set of competing theologies, each one of them actually assuming that there could be no solemn truth attainable by the researches of learning. You must either set up a number of permanent denominations and as many theologies as there are denominations, which is the most fatal thing in the world; or else you must wait a little longer, until the spirit which has been so long triumphing over disabilities in Oxford and Cambridge completes its triumph, and carries the liberation from all tests and subscriptions into the Divinity schools as they are carried into those schools in other Universities. I say that is the thing to which we ought to look, and not the question of rival theologies. As to the attempt to go and swamp, as it were, the narrow theology of the High Church, and set up something that we declare to be so much freer, nobler, and so forth, that appears to me to be the most likely thing to check the progress of that liberation which has so long been begun. In my opinion, the orthodoxy in our way is struck with a canker and blight, which is eating away its root, and will destroy it. We have nothing to do but to leave it to die in its own way; but the moment you set up an antagonistic position, and try to preach as missionaries, you create a feeling which would be fatal to your success. I myself have the greatest attachment, regard, and reverence for our old Universities, and I would not like to see them spoilt by being made competition-places for every kind of proposition. One other matter I must just touch upon, and that is respecting the moral and spiritual training of our young men there. I am sure I am the last to show any appearance of ingratitude to Oxford at this particular

moment, but at the same time it would be very poor gratitude to take our College to Oxford at present if Oxford did not wish to accept it. They would say, *Timeo Danaos et dona ferentes.* I believe that we should be regarded as attacking persons if we were to take our College there. That is the thing. Not only that, but I may say it seems to me the language in which the prevailing tone of Oxford society has been spoken of here is not only exaggerated, but incorrect. To my mind the religious tone of Oxford, which is spread by the Ritualistic party, and the non-religious tone, which is spread by the diffusion of Agnosticism, are both of them alike morbid and unhealthy, and nothing but a kind of sickly influence, to which it is not well to expose our young men. They have no sympathy with one or the other. Supposing them to remain undisturbed, they have no sympathy to meet in any public worship. They could not go to any chapel but their own. The little College chapel would only contain our students. We have twenty-two, and we may have two or three other men dropping in, and no more, I believe. They do not expect to have large congregations, still less are there any schools, missions, or work of any kind, to exercise their religious affections. In that respect they are different from the Independents. The latter have home missions, foreign missions, country chapels, and various institutions ready to their hand, in which to exercise the religious affection of the students and prepare them for their future mission. Anyone who knows the place knows that Oxford is not the right place for our students. There is nobody to support our College ; it would rest entirely upon the Professor and students themselves ; and is it likely that that kind of small attempt to retain their faithful worship could hold its ground against the attractions of the richer worship of the Oxford chapels, with their music and everything that is attractive and interesting ? I say not. I say when I compare that with the state of things in London, where we have our domestic missions, and a multitude of chapels, where we have Sunday-schools, where we have work for everyone who can devote his Sundays and spare time to it, I should prefer to remain here. Therefore, however much more may be the learning that may be attained at Oxford, I may say, looking at the questions as a question regarding the education of the future ministers of our Churches, I cannot look with favour upon the removal.

The Rev. R. A. Armstrong.

It is with a feeling of great diffidence that I rise in succession to Dr. Martineau, and especially to utter views which differ from his own, and in the utterance of which I shall be necessarily thrown to a certain extent into an attitude of criticism towards words which we have all listened to with the deepest reverence—(hear, hear). But I should be a false pupil of Dr. Martineau if, feeling a call upon me, any personal timidity held me back from saying a word which I think, at any rate, it is a duty to say. I may, perhaps, devote a moment

or two before adverting to what Dr. Martineau has said, to two remarks which have fallen from other Trustees. My friend Mr. Clayden excepted theology in the University as not being open in the same sense in which other studies are open. I think that what we all waited for, before desiring that those who sympathise with us should become students of the University, was not till theology should be opened in every conceivable way like every other subject, but till our students could go there without in any way forfeiting their own integrity. Now, theology is to this extent open at the present time in Oxford—that our students can go and study there without any subscription. They can go, as Dr. Martineau has admitted, on certain conditions, without attending any worship which they conscientiously object to, and they can even take their degree in theology.

The Rev. Dr. SADLER: What do you mean by taking their degree in theology?

The Rev. R. A. ARMSTRONG: They can take their B.A. in theology

Dr. SADLER: Not in theology.

The Rev. P. H. WICKSTEED: The subject you take it in may be theology; theology is one of the arts.

Mr. MUIRHEAD: As an Oxford man, I may say Mr. Armstrong is quite right.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: To advert to another point; Mr. Lister has complained that our Report is a one-sided Report. I am afraid we must acknowledge it is so; but as one who has served not only on the Committee but on the Sub-Committee which has had the general investigation of this subject, I may say that there were gentlemen on the Sub-Committee of every variety of opinion at the outset, and it was the fault of the facts and not the fault of the gentlemen, if, when the investigations were complete, they were almost unanimous. The Special Committee carried their report to the General Committee, feeling very doubtful as to what the issue would be; but so overwhelming did the arguments appear to the General Committee, when they learnt the considerations which had actuated that Report, that they carried it by a very large majority—a far larger majority than any of us on the Sub-Committee considered probable. So it is simply step by step that we have been led on, and almost forced into the position we have taken, first of all by the untenability of the present position of Manchester New College, and, secondly, by the strong call made upon us to go with our witness and our testimony to Oxford. Dr. Martineau has read a letter from one who is regarded with the deepest esteem by every gentleman in this room. I am surprised to learn, from what Dr. Martineau said, that the subject, in its present aspect, was new to Mr. Rathbone. It is not a new matter to us. It is a matter which has deeply interested and moved us, not only for the last nine years since last the question was discussed by our Trustees, but for many years anterior to that; and greatly as I value Mr. Rathbone's opinion on practical subjects, I must say the weight of his opinion appears to be somewhat discounted by the short period of time through which his consideration extended. Mr.

Rathbone in his letter alluded, in a way which I am sure met with a response in the heart of all of us, to the ancient Puritan spirit of our theology and the lack of that spirit in the University of Oxford. I must say it seemed to me that the natural conclusion from such a comparison was that we ought to go to Oxford. If there is indeed that lack of moral earnestness, that lack of an intense desire for truth which characterised our Presbyterian forefathers and their Puritan ancestors, surely, if we have one spark of the old Puritan spirit left in us to-day, we should be eager to go there to hold up a light which should not be unworthy of the light our forefathers held up. We are told that the new tone of Oxford conversation is, "Well, it is possible it may be so, and it is possible it may not be so; but it does not matter much whether it is so or not." Surely, then, there is no sphere in England which more loudly calls us to go and bear our witness as to what we think of such a tone of conversation. We want by the enthusiasm of our young men, by the enthusiasm of our Professors, perhaps more than by actual argument and controversy, to touch some of the choicest spirits among the young men of the rising generation with that love of truth for its own sake which has ever been the characteristic of the College of which we are proud to be Trustees. Dr. Martineau has adverted to a confusion in some of the speeches between the two questions of taking our undergraduates to Oxford and taking our graduates there. It is perfectly true that those are distinct problems—(hear, hear). As he says, some of our undergraduates already go there. Now we believe that by carrying the graduates there also we should increase the attraction of Oxford to undergraduate students, and that by degrees a larger proportion of them will select that University as the place of their undergraduate studies, a thing which we regard as most desirable. Then with regard to the theological students, we are challenged to give any reason why the theological school should be carried to Oxford. We have given the reasons in the Report, but I will reiterate what seem to us the overwhelming reasons for carrying the theological school to Oxford. First, for the sake of our own undergraduates—(hear, hear)—that they may not be entirely abandoned to the atmosphere which Dr. Martineau has described. Secondly, for the sake of the laymen connected with such families as are represented here to-day, believing as we do that if our College were established there, a larger proportion of the young laymen of our influential families would resort to Oxford University than do at present—(hear, hear). Thirdly, because we believe that Oxford, as the historic ground of theology, affords the happiest atmosphere in which men can study theology. We believe that Oxford, whence Wycliffe sent out his "poor preachers," Oxford where the Wesleys began their work, Oxford the scene of the labours of Cardinal Newman before he joined the Roman Church, Oxford, which gave that strange religious inspiration even to the Agnosticism and scepticism of Matthew Arnold, Oxford which produced Professor Green—we believe that Oxford is the sphere where theology can be studied with the highest interest

and the richest associations drawn from the past. We believe, further, that even if it should be the will of Providence, as I suppose it will be, that Dr. Hatch and Dr. Cheyne should pass away, the same temper which has appointed those men to that University will appoint other men of the like sort—(hear, hear). We cannot now be the first, but let us be the second to recognise the spirit which animates at any rate some part of the governing bodies at Oxford since those appointments have been made. Lastly, and this, to my mind, is the overwhelming reason which lays it upon us almost as a charge from God to go to this University—if our College is worth anything at all, if the things for which it has lived for the last 100 years, if the things for which its founders and their fathers before them lived and died in the years that preceded them, if those things are worth anything at all, if there be the chaos of religious opinion which Dr. Martineau has described at Oxford, we are bound, whether we will or no, to bear some witness there. Let who will hear, let who will turn away—(cheers). We are not going in any sectarian spirit for the sake of preaching any particular dogmas, dear to us as the particular dogmas may be. We are going that we may set the example of free teaching and free learning in theology. Should free teaching and free learning in theology be recognised in the great religious centre of English life, or should they not? If we are not going to proclaim them, who is? Can a Broad Church proclaim them? There is no community in this country save ours that ever can or will carry to Oxford that noble spirit of free learning in theology, that spirit of free teaching which we have inherited, and to which our faithful teachers have devoted their lives. Sir, to my mind, the most formidable argument advanced against the Oxford movement is that which one or two speakers, especially Dr. Martineau, have advanced, namely, the lack of opportunity for practical missionary work. I have tried to look at this thing straight, with the memory of my own student days in my mind, and with a very considerable knowledge of the young men who have come out of the College since I was one of its students, and I believe, Sir, that we may sometimes lay too heavy a weight upon those young spirits, if at the very same time they are taxing their intellects by the highest efforts which they can make, we ask them to go and labour in the purlieus of East London, to witness the misery and try to solve the social problems of our day. I have been grieved to see the burden of premature care which has sometimes sat on some of those young men, and I have longed sometimes that instead of turning eastward they would turn west or north, and go and get a little fresh air, a little manly exercise, and a little invigorating recreation. A friend of mine, a young solicitor, who has lodged with many of our students, not in the most recent years, but before the present compulsory residence in this Hall, testifies how very hard it used to be ever to get any student of Manchester New College to go to play at tennis or cricket. These may seem small things, but they are not small things; they belong to a true and noble manhood. I venture to say, with some

trepidation, that I was not altogether a regular student at Manchester New College, and I know that by that fact I lost very much which can now, alas! never be repaired. But I am also conscious that sometimes by missing a lecture and playing a cricket match I did at least as much to prepare myself for usefulness as a Christian minister, for coming in touch and contact with the young men with whom I should afterwards have to deal, as I should have done by sitting under the best lecture ever given—(hear, hear). Now I want to send these young men where a game of cricket or a pull upon the river shall not be a thing to be stolen, but a thing to be freely enjoyed—(hear, hear). There is, however, something else besides physical recreation which may be crushed out of a young man's life by too much study combined with too much philanthropic labour, and that is the seasons for quiet devotion. I hold it to be the greatest evil in the present constitution of the lives of our young students that the more eager and earnest they are to be working in the fields of Christ, the more is the time for quiet devotion pressed out of their young lives. Those who are to listen to their preaching—and to their praying—afterwards will not, I think, Sir, be the sufferers if for a little while they are allowed to defer those terrible toils amongst the poor and suffering, and are allowed to spend their young lives in a brighter atmosphere, tempering the labour of mental study by those things which God meant to make young men's lives glad. Now Dr. Martineau has conversed with Dr. Fairbairn. I believe that Dr. Fairbairn has been the fortunate recipient of not a few visits from gentlemen interested in this College within the last few weeks—(laughter)—and a man examined in different interests may sometimes appear to bear different witness. I believe I am correct in saying that Dr. Fairbairn, at the discourses which he delivers every Sunday evening during term at nine o'clock, in connection with the College which is presided over by him, has an attendance of somewhere between 80 and 130 members of the University—(hear, hear). I believe I am also correct, Sir, in saying that he is full of hope for this movement of his. If we had been there first, Sir, I do not know whether Dr. Fairbairn would have refrained from going. At any rate, this I hold, that if the freer spirit of theology is to be carried to the old Universities, we are the people to do it. Our College alone is free from theological tests and limitations. If we go to Oxford I hope we shall be able largely to co-operate with Dr. Fairbairn and with his professors. I hope that friendships may spring up between our students and his, and perhaps a closer neighbourliness may arise between that great branch of the Christian Church which he represents and that of which we are members. But I do not think that because they have had the foresight and the courage to go there a year or two ago, we are to be kept back for twenty years. We must all have been profoundly moved by the language in which Dr. Martineau uttered his lament on the infidelity of some who have been born and bred amongst us to the great principle of absolute integrity in the worship of God. If any conformity, over so small, to a religious standard which they could not accept

were to be demanded of our men I for one would fight against ever going there with my latest breath. But he has told us that there is no compulsion to attend the College prayers. He has, however, added that if men do not attend, they are then marked men. Well, Sir, many of our forefathers were marked men—(applause)—and were none the worse for that. I wish that some of us had to be marked men a little more than we have in these days. Then perhaps we should be a little more faithful to those great principles which Dr. Martineau has vindicated. At any rate, if our policy is carried out, these students will not be left in the desolate state which Dr. Martineau has described. If they cannot conscientiously attend the worship now provided, we propose to give them a substitute. We propose to invite young men to come, at any rate on Sundays, and worship with us in the manner their fathers worshipped; in the same freedom and integrity of heart. May I, Sir, before I sit down, quote half-a-dozen lines which were quoted in a debate on a kindred subject nine years ago, and which I think will come with great and high authority to the men and women whom I see before me now? John James Tayler wrote many years ago—in the year 1864—these words:—"Though it will not be in my time, and I should regard any precipitate forestalling of such a result as positively mischievous and likely to retard rather than advance the cause of true religious liberty, I hold it to be nearly inevitable in the course of future events, that our dear old College, with its accumulated memories of Warrington, Manchester and London, will become ultimately an independent foundation in one of our ancient seats of learning." The question in Mr. Tayler's mind seems to have been the question of time, and if we are to be led in any way by him, the question we have to ask to-day is—Is the time come? What should be the signs of the times which should call us to the ancient Universities? Surely the wide opening of those Universities, the wide opening of their hospitable gates; the democratising of the Universities which has been so marked a feature in many directions for the last ten or fifteen years. Again, there is a crisis, which some of the speakers have endeavoured to minimise, but which is none the less a crisis, in the conduct of our institution here, and I say, when that crisis happens simultaneously with so marked a movement in the Universities themselves, that the very moment has come which Mr. Tayler in his wisdom predicted, and that we should be true to his noble spirit if we go to Oxford with our College and with our word of hope. Sir, I have spoken far longer than I intended to speak; but after all fifteen or twenty minutes' speech bears but a small proportion to twelve or fourteen years of ardent desire and great longing, and if I have in any degree worn out your patience--("No, no")—I ask you to consider that the men who have pleaded with you to-day have been men who may put their cause too feebly, but men who at any rate have believed in that cause for many years, have come to this meeting to-day with great hope of success, and will go away dejected indeed if the battle is again lost, and has again to be fought out in years to come—(cheers).

Three or four gentlemen then rose to address the meeting, and were received with cries of "Vote!" and calls for "Hargrove" and "Solly."

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Solly first caught my eye.

THE REV. H. SOLLY.

I am sorry, Sir, to interpose between the meeting and the division, but I wish much to put before the meeting one view which has not been touched upon, and which I think ought to be fairly presented to your minds before we go to a division. For it seems to me there is an alternative course that ought to be considered before this College is committed to the irrevocable step of going to Oxford. Many of the arguments we have heard show that our course is not to remove this College there, but to establish an Oxford mission. I believe it would be of immense value to bring such influences to bear on the Oxford University as have been traced to the supposed establishment of this College in that ancient University; but I cannot see that this is an argument for taking our College to any institution where the students would not gain the primary object of the whole College—the best training possible. I think the argument with regard to attending to mission and Sunday-school work in London is one of unspeakable importance, and I cannot agree with my eloquent friend who has just sat down that such attendance must mar the vitality or injure the health, or in any way diminish the usefulness, mentally, morally, or physically, of the students; for just in proportion as they are fitted for the career to which they have consecrated themselves will they find such work the very best possible relaxation to them, as well as the best preparation for the ministry. But what I was going to observe with regard to the alternative course is this. As a Governor of University College I cannot help feeling grateful to Professor Morley for what he said, since I believe it is very possible that University College might rise again to such a position as would enable it to supply alumni of Manchester New College with all their requirements and all that they could receive from Oxford University. At present that does not appear to be literally the case; but that is an argument for a strong appeal to the authorities of University College to bring up their teaching to its former high standard. I believe that London has already done a good work for this College, and I think, considering the men we have amongst us at this day, honoured and influential men, who have upborne the standard of what they believe to be true and right, we ought not to run down this great metropolis as exercising an adverse or even an inadequate influence for good on the training of our ministers. Those very men, remember, who have been pleading to-day with such eloquence, were trained in London, and received their preparation for the ministerial functions in this College and in this Hall. Therefore I maintain, Sir, it must be within the limits of possibility that it still

may be made to provide the best possible training, especially when we consider the adverse influences at Oxford which Dr. Martineau has so powerfully explained. I am quite ready to move, if it be desirable, as an amendment in favour of an alternative course:—"That the Committee be requested to communicate with the authorities of University College, and ask them to propose such measures for the adaptation of University College training to the wants of Manchester New College as may be practicable and possible, and to take a lease of a portion of University Hall." I see that it is impossible for the College to go on on its present footing. I quite admit the force of what has been said to the effect that this College cannot keep a lodging-house for the benefit of students of University College. I understand that financial difficulty, but I would ask whether the Trustees of University College cannot take a lease of such portion of the premises of University Hall as may not be required for students of Manchester New College. I should be prepared to move the amendment I have suggested; but, apart from that, I must unhesitatingly give my vote against a proposal which would, I believe, commit us to an absolutely irreversible experiment, and which would cut us off from many of the best influences which I believe could affect this College.

Several gentlemen again rose to speak, and the cries of "Vote" and "Hargrove" were repeated.

Mr. Blazeby: I wish to ask whether the laymen, if there are such present, will not have the privilege of speaking? Their commonsense is quite refreshing—(laughter).

Dr. C. A. Greaves.

I have great pleasure in seconding the amendment of Mr. Solly. I have not the privilege of being a graduate of Oxford, nor have I had the privilege of being brought up here, and I saw this beautiful Hall for the first time yesterday; but I happen to be a graduate of Durham, which is peculiar amongst British Universities, in having two courses, one in Arts and one in Theology. I am told that all the students at present working in Manchester New College, save and except one, are against the proposed change to Oxford. If we could afford to set up in Oxford, not a mere coffee-house, but a real College like Keble, or that other place at Cambridge, we might be doing some good. But what are we going to do? Just to set up a rendezvous for Unitarians to go to when they like. Is it the fact that all the life of the country is at Oxford? I should rather think there is a vast deal of life in London. London is not a Sleepy Hollow. I know the influence of this place is a great deal exercised in the South of England. I speak as a Kentish man, and I say that our chapels there are very much indebted to the students and teachers who most usefully come out to us.

Mr. Frederick Nettlefold.

I rise in response to a remark of Mr. Blazeby that he thought it was time some laymen spoke on the discussion with a little common sense. I rise, Sir, because I am a layman, and not because I have any common sense. I had, I thought, when I entered this room, some little common sense, but that has been in a great measure dissipated. I find, on reading over this Report, that the arguments in it are against its conclusions, and the speeches to which I have listened from the opposite side, and very valuable speeches indeed they are, are also against the arguments of the Report; so the state of muddle in which I am at this present moment is somewhat considerable. Mr. Armstrong, in the very able speech which he gave us, really seemed to exult in that difficulty to which Dr. Martineau called attention, and which we who send our sons to Oxford, and any theological students who go to Oxford must also feel—the difficulty of attending the College chapels. I had a son at Oxford, and I felt that was a very great difficulty.

Mr. Armstrong: I said they were not compelled to attend chapel. I should be very far from exulting in it.

Mr. Nettlefold: You misunderstand me. I was going on to say that when it comes to claiming exemption the undergraduates become marked men, and you exulted that they should be marked men—(hear, hear). The argument of the Report is, that students of Manchester New College will mingle with the stream, and will be marked off by no distinction from the other students of their Colleges during their undergraduate career. So how, on the one hand, you can exult at men becoming marked men because they have declined to attend services in which they cannot conscientiously join, and at the same time express a hope that all distinction will be removed, I do not quite understand; and that is one of the puzzles confusing me at the present moment. Then, again, as I understand the Report, there is no use whatever, so far as Manchester New College students are concerned, in taking Manchester New College down to Oxford. The Report says the results of External Scholarships to undergraduates have been, on the whole, admirable; and students have not been seduced away from that preparation for the dissenting ministry to which they had devoted themselves. Clearly, then, in order to protect the theological students there is no need to move Manchester New College to Oxford; it may just as well remain in London. But then it seems to me that the Report contradicts itself, because, almost in the next paragraph, it says that the life in Oxford is prejudicial to our lay students. How the life at Oxford can be prejudicial to our lay students and not prejudicial to our theological students I cannot quite understand. It is a distinction which certainly does not appeal to my common sense. Here are young men who go to Oxford at the same age; they feel the same high spirits, the same desires, hopes, and aspirations; the laymen are injuriously affected; the theological students are not. Like causes

generally produce like results, and I cannot therefore follow the argument of this Report when it says that the theological students are not injuriously affected at Oxford. I cannot but think they are. If laymen are, and the Report says laymen are, then I think theological students are also, and I do not think we ought to subject them to this prejudicial influence which, the Report states, exists at Oxford. Again, I am in a state of confusion, for, according to the speech which Mr. Armstrong has delivered, as far as I could understand it, he seemed to think that the practical work of the ministry, mission work, Sunday-school teaching, preaching, &c., was far too hard a task to be put on our theological students. Is it not a part of their education? I cannot conceive a more valuable part of their education than preparing for the work they will have to follow in after life. Mr. Armstrong was arguing that the Report is favourable to the proposal. The Report does not support him at all. The Report says that the absence of opportunities for working among the poor is one drawback to the proposal. Gentlemen, it is not a mere drawback to the proposal; it is fatal to the proposal. I mean to say that if there is no practical work to be done at Oxford, Oxford is not the place for our theological students. I know the Report goes on to suggest a means by which that difficulty could be overcome. How overcome? By adding another year to the theological course, which would assume the shape of a curacy under some minister in a large congregation. Therefore, students would have to go through their theological course, and after that have to prepare themselves for the Ministry. It is virtually making it a four years' course. Another objection I have to make is on the question of finance. Seventy-five pounds is recommended by this Report to be given to the students at Oxford. Now, it is perfectly impossible that any student can live at Oxford on £75 a year, or even double that; and yet one of the objects of going to Oxford, as stated in the Report, is that our theological and lay students may live together, form companionships and friendships one with another. Our theological students cannot do it if you give them only £75 a year. It is perfectly impossible. Remember their incomes cannot be supplemented to any large extent by what their parents may be able to give them. Our ministers, I am sorry to say, generally cannot afford to keep their sons at a University like Oxford; and, therefore, if you suppose that those men can go to Oxford, form friendships with, and live on equality with, the lay students there, I am quite sure your hopes are doomed to be disappointed. There is one paragraph in the Report which says that a very large and healthy saving will be effected by this removal to Oxford, in the cost of the undergraduates—that is, reckoning the cost of the undergraduates at £75 per annum. A saving, Sir, I believe there will be, and a large saving, because I do not believe you will get any theological students at Oxford at all. They cannot live there; they cannot exist there—(hear, hear). Therefore there will be a very large saving. But if the saving which would be effected by the absence of students from Manchester New College

be called a healthy saving, I differ altogether from the Report, and I should be very sorry, indeed, that any saving were so effected. But if you have to pay the students more than £75 a year, in order to secure their attendance in London you will have to pay a much larger sum if you ensure their attendance—that is, by paying all their expenses—at Oxford. If you have the same number of students you will find that your expenses will be considerably increased, and that there will be no saving whatever. I object to this Report in another way, and on that ground, also, I say we cannot accept it. I consider that the finance question has been most inadequately dealt with. It has not been touched upon. What is the cost of what we are asked to do to-day? The Report is perfectly silent as to that. Not a syllable is said as regards the cost of the buildings we are asked to erect at Oxford. Are they to cost £50,000 or £100,000? I have heard both sums mentioned; I really do not know. I am not afraid of either sum, gentlemen, if it is for a good object. But I tell you, I would much rather spend £100,000 on a residential College at Oxford than £50,000 on the building that it is proposed to erect there. Supposing we take only the smaller sum; supposing the chapel and other buildings proposed to be erected should cost only £50,000, and we got something for the sale of this University Hall. It would be a most miserable thing to sell this Hall. That of itself ought to condemn the scheme. Whether Manchester New College leaves it or not, let us determine, at any rate, to keep University Hall. But, supposing it were to be sold—and that is one of the arguments used in this Report—supposing it were to be sold, and that it fetched £12,000, £6,000 of that would have to be devoted to paying the debt to Manchester New College, and £6,000 would be left towards the building fund, leaving £44,000 to be provided. That would mean a rent of £2,000 per annum at Oxford against £200 here. Now, one of the recommendations of this Report, and one of the reasons for moving to Oxford, is, that you thereby escape the heavy responsibility and entanglements of University Hall. Why, you escape receiving a profit which last year was over £100 in order to incur a responsibility of £2,000 a-year for rent at Oxford. I know perfectly well I may be told that there will be no rent whatever to pay if the capital sum is raised; but that is a very fallacious argument. If any gentleman here gives £10,000 to this scheme he is virtually giving £500 a year towards the rent of the buildings at Oxford. That is to say, his income is less by £500 a-year. And so it will be with respect to the whole £44,000. It will represent £2,000 a-year, which the Unitarian body will not be able to devote to other purposes, because it will be swallowed up in the rent of buildings at Oxford. I do think that for this, and for the other reasons I have urged, we should hesitate very much indeed before we adopt the resolution which has been brought before us to-day. As I said before, I do not object to any amount that may be asked for if really good cause can be shown for the outlay. But we are asked to advance that large sum in favour of a scheme

which has so many possibilities of failure, without any proof whatever that all the hopes and aspirations with which this Report is so liberally charged will in any degree be realised. One word, Sir, and I have done, and that is one word of warning. If we take Manchester New College to Oxford the step is final ; we can never retrace it ; that is clear –(hear, hear). Then may not these buildings which we are asked to erect at Oxford at so great an expense be in more senses than one the last resting-place of Manchester New College ?—(cheers).

Several gentlemen again rose to speak, and were received with cries of "Vote !"

The Rev. H. Solly : I beg to say that, as my object has been attained in presenting to the meeting an alternative course, in case the original resolution is lost, I withdraw my amendment.

Mr. W. P. Price.

Mr. Chairman, for six weeks I have had an engagement on public business, which I supposed would have occupied me for three days ; and it is only by accident that I have been released, and have been able to be present for the last hour at your meeting. Nor should I have thought it necessary to have troubled you at all but for the accident, also, that as I came into this Hall I met, going out of it, a friend well-known to all of us, Mr. Philip Henry Lawrence, who requested me to take charge, for him, of a statement he had undertaken to make here, and to make it if I had an opportunity, and if I thought it could be made usefully. Mr. Nettlefold has alluded in forcible language to a very important question in reference to this matter, namely, the financial question, and it is because the statement I am charged to make in Mr. Lawrence's behalf is strictly germane to the financial question, that I thought it right to ask leave to interrupt the proceedings only for a very few minutes. The statement that I have to make is as follows :—That if the Trustees decide to remove to Oxford, and if land there suitable for the College is acquired, a munificent donor is prepared to give the sum of £5,000 toward the cost of buildings to be erected upon it, and towards the general purposes of the College—(cheers). I have no authority, myself, to divulge the name of the donor, but I believe there is a gentlemen in this room who has that authority, if he thinks fit to do so. That will scarcely be necessary at this stage of the proceedings, because I can give you my own assurance that the offer I have communicated to you is *bonâ fide*. I am not able, myself, to take any part in the general discussion, for the reason I have given—because, in the first place, anything I might say has no doubt been said many times already ; also because it is impossible for me to answer arguments which I have not heard. I would, therefore, only ask leave to say this—that I am one of those who regard with favour the removal of this College to Oxford ; and I do so because,

whilst I have no reason to be dissatisfied, but quite the reverse, with the admirable training which our young men have always received at Manchester New College ; whilst I believe they acquire a classical and theological education second to none they could obtain in any part of the world, yet I fear that at Manchester New College they have not that opportunity of mingling with the intellectual world at large which they would have in that place, through which the great intellectual current must of necessity pass—namely, Oxford—and because I have always felt that those who are to minister to us efficiently must be those who are enabled in some measure to associate themselves with the interests which underlie the current of our daily lives. I am decidedly of opinion that men who have the opportunity of a larger mingling with the world, at Oxford, than they could possibly have here, under the conditions in which they live here, are more likely to efficiently discharge the important and serious duties of the Christian ministry than men who are educated under the conditions which prevail in this place. I beg you to take notice of the statement I have made on Mr. Lawrence's behalf—(cheers).

The Rev. C. Hargrove.

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen,—The grave warning with which Mr. Nettlefold concluded his speech means simply that the step we contemplated is one that should not be taken without the most serious consideration, and it seems to me that anyone who supposes that such consideration has not been given to it these many years past must have but a poor opinion of those who advocate it. At this late hour I will make but a few remarks as to the influences which Oxford will bring to bear upon us and we in our turn upon Oxford. As to our undergraduates, the question does not now arise whether young Unitarians are to go to the old Universities or not ; they do go, and will continue to go ; and Dr. Martineau in words of solemn warning, which will, I hope, be read in all our congregations, has described the evil effect upon character of being placed at such a critical time of life in circumstances where they have no choice between joining in worship with which they have no intellectual sympathy or giving up public worship altogether. The only practical question now as regards them is, whether we are to follow them whither they go and encourage them to stand fast in that old spirit of Nonconformity—"we do not believe and we will not profess to believe"—which our fathers maintained at so much cost to themselves through so many generations ; or whether we are to abandon them and let them abandon us. For lost to us now are the greater number of our young men who go up to Cambridge or Oxford. But as respects our graduate students and our Professors, with whom we are specially concerned to-day, it is because I believe that the University of Oxford will have the best effect on this College, and because this College holds a grand position, I do not say in the Unitarian body, but in the world ; because it is the one Institution which upholds the free learning and free teaching

of theology, the one in which truth only is sought, and not with truth or above truth the defence of established creeds—it is on this account that I am anxious to see it where it shall have the fullest influence and at the same time the fullest opportunities of increase. And first, what would be the effect on our students of Oxford training? This notable advantage they would have, of free access to the lectures of eminent professors. I am myself a debtor, I cannot say to how great an extent, to the lectures of Dr. Lightfoot and Dr. Westcott which I attended at Cambridge. Not that they are very "broad," as we judge of breadth, or that I ever was in accord with all they taught. But the method and spirit, the earnestness and exactness of their teaching was invaluable for instruction and example. It has been said that the present liberal-minded theological professors will pass away. Of course they will, but whoever succeed will be men of scholarship and piety, from whose classes our students may gain much which will serve them all their lives. As to our Professors, it would be presumptuous in me to pay them compliments; they are an honour to our College and our faith, and we are all proud of such work as that which has lately been given to the world by our present Principal; but however well they have done, they will be the first to admit that they might do better still. And in two ways Oxford will help them. First, the very atmosphere of the place would be a stimulus to exertion. London is great in business and politics, and literature and art, and fashion and religion, in everything except in serious theological study; of that Oxford is the English home and centre. All great movements of the past century have had there a beginning, and all the Churches fight their battles there. And, secondly, they might be freed from much of the work with which they seemed now to be overwhelmed; each having imposed him some three or four subjects, every one of which would by itself absorb all a man's time and energies. At Oxford we should make use for our purposes of University lectures, and so transfer to the University much of the present heavy charge laid upon our professors. Reference has been made to-day, especially by Mr. Nettlefold, to the want of mission work at Oxford. I venture, in opposition to him, to say that that is an advantage and not a loss. After all, there is something else besides mission work—the pursuit of truth, not for its own sake merely, as a selfish possession, but as something which is to be given to the world; the spirit of devotion which is to be communicated to the world, that is more important even than mission work for our students. But they are not excluded from mission work. The year at Oxford consists of three terms, each of some eight weeks, and at the end of each we expect these men to return to the town from which they came and to go to the minister of that town and say—"How can I help you?" If a man came to me from Oxford or from here and said he was ready to do anything he could, I would find enough for him to do. But then he should return to College and say—"I have nothing to think about with regard to Sunday-school or practical work. My one thought is my studies, by which I am to prepare myself for the

ministry ; my object is to use in the very best way the few months available for my preparation." After all, there are only about eighteen months in all to be so used, and during that time students should concentrate all their attention on their studies. Surely that is not a loss of time ; surely they will not suffer because during that time they are without practical work. The question has been debated in old time amongst Roman Catholics in England, whether the students for the priesthood should be educated along with other students in Colleges, or whether it would be preferable to put them in seminaries, and there educate them for the priesthood. It is much the same question that there is here. Shall we put our men to mix with the world, or to educate them and train them for the ministry with the three professors and amongst themselves? We are told that with the small means they have they cannot mix with Oxford life. I entirely deny it. The number of poor men at the University is continually on the increase—(hear, hear). I think one of the worst judges we can have would be a man of such wealth and position as Mr. Rathbone, when he speaks about his own sons going to Oxford. There have always been sons of poor clergymen and poor tradesmen going there, from all parts of the country ; men who just manage to make both ends meet, and it is a very good thing to learn to manage to do that, if you are to have a minister's salary. I say there are plenty of those men who do manage to get into University life, and know all that is going on at the University. It is forgotten that while we allow £50 a year, a man who is worth his salt, and who will be anything in our ministry, and who is worth having in our ministry, will surely be able to get something more from prizes. There are many men who have made their mark in life who have been trained in a University as sizars. There are Exhibitions and Scholarships without number, and everyone ought to be able to get something, or, if he cannot, I do not know that he is worth our support for the ministry for which he proves himself intellectually incompetent. One more word, gentlemen, with regard to our influence upon the University. I am not going to say that if Manchester New College goes to the University of Oxford we should break down the test of creed and create a new spirit there. I do not believe anything of the kind. But Dr. Martineau told us that there are at the University two great movements—that of Ritualism and that of Agnosticism ; and he seemed to imply that that is a reason why we should not go there. It is to my mind the strongest appeal to go there. It has been said that we should have no success at a University where we have not a call. Is there any town in England where orthodox ministers of religion asked us to go and establish there a chapel of our own? Is there a single Broad Churchman to be found who will say, "Will you not come and establish yourselves in my parish?" Would not everyone of them say, and possibly the Broad Churchman more than the others, "Keep away from us ; you will injure us and our cause?" In spite of that we feel constrained to go everywhere, and wherever we find a small knot of poor uneducated people calling for us to build a

chapel, that call is responded to. Therefore I take it that what has been said about keeping away from Oxford is a reason for our going there. Young men going to a University meet for the first time the problems of theology. Questions arise that they have not thought of. They find the old foundation shaking under them. The principles that they have been taught from childhood as absolute and unquestionable become in their minds doubtful. They ask, what then? They are, as it were, suffering from a mental earthquake; they do not know what to trust. They see before them the abyss of scepticism, from which the only refuge seems to be ritualism. It is our duty to go down and help them. We should go down with our Professors to uphold those principles of rational and eternal theology which cannot and will not be kept back.

Rev. John Robberds.

I wish to say with regard to York that my experience is different from Dr. Martineau's, as I found that a considerable proportion of the lay students mixed on friendly and familiar terms with the Divinity students. They had the same rowing club, the same cricket club, and I think there was no difference of rank recognised amongst us. Four of us at least married into the families of our fellow-students, and some of the most pleasant associations in our lives we formed there.

Mr. J. H. Muirhead.

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen,—I have only one word to say, and I think, perhaps, as the only Oxford graduate who has spoken to-day, I ought at least to have an opportunity of saying it. I only wish to refer to the practical question, so ably touched upon by Mr. Hargrove—the matter of the Exhibitions which are proposed by the new scheme. If you turn to page 13 of the Report you will observe that an Exhibition of £75 a-year is the highest Exhibition which may be obtained from this College by an undergraduate student who proposes to go to the University of Oxford. Mr. Hargrove has said that anyone who cannot make up the deficiency between that sum and the cost of his residence at Oxford is not a student who ought to be supported by this College. What are the sources from which a student at Oxford can hope to obtain the additional money which is required? The sum at its lowest is £120, and £75 taken from that is £45. From what source in Oxford is that £45 to be obtained? There is only one source. Anyone who knows anything about Oxford University knows that there is only one source from which that can be got. It can be got from Exhibitions and scholarships, and Mr. Hargrove said that the only students worthy of obtaining the benefits of the College are such men as can obtain such a scholarship. I know something about the standards at Oxford, and I say that the majority of the students who come to you would be absolutely excluded if, in addition to your own, they had to obtain an Oxford Scholarship or Exhibition—(hear, hear). The kind of students we are likely to get, and the kind of students who make frequently the very best clergymen and the best practical workers, are men who could not make up that deficiency of £45 in any way in Oxford—(hear, hear). What do you provide for the graduates who are resident in Oxford? On page 14 I

read that it is £50 per annum. What are their additional sources of revenue besides this beggarly £50, because it is so in view of the expenses of life in Oxford? Where are they to get the additional sum to make up £120? Anyone, again, who knows anything about Oxford University knows that there is only one source; that is by a man being a Fellow of a College. Any other source from which he could get that money, such as coaching, would take up his time, and prevent him from going on with his theological studies. I have great sympathy with the Committee in this matter, and would give my heartiest support to the College if this did not seem to me to be a very serious difficulty. In London or Glasgow there are boundless resources from which a man may make a living. He may be a teacher or an artisan, and he may in a Scottish town turn his energy in many directions to make up the requisite amount. Looking at it practically, that seems a very serious matter. Will this movement, if you go on with it, have the immediate effect of decreasing your students, and can you afford such a decrease? That is a question I should like you to consider from a practical point of view. Perhaps you will forgive me if I speak plainly upon the motion before us. I think it is a duty we owe to one another that we should speak our own minds. Looking at the thing, without any personal feeling, I think that if the College were a larger institution—if it were anything like the size of an Oxford College—it would be well to go to Oxford. It would then have an opportunity of making itself felt, and of making its mark upon University life; but in its present size, with three Professors and fourteen students, I cannot see what hope there can be of making any impression upon the great life of Oxford University. It would be simply to sink the College. Its influence could not make itself felt, as it is at present—(hear, hear). The smallest Oxford College has upwards of twenty Fellows, one or two Professors, and, I suppose, an average of fifty undergraduates. People say it would be a great thing to hold up the standard of free religion in the present Agnostic state of university education; but is not London Agnostic? I say there is not any great city where the general average thought is not utterly Agnostic. If this College is looking for a sphere where Agnosticism is at its worst, is there anywhere where it would be found worse than it is in London?—(hear, hear, and cries of "Time!" and "Vote").

Sir Roland K. Wilson.

Mr. Chairman: I should like to mention something which I think may interest those present here, and which happens to come within my knowledge, as I believe I am the only* University resident in this room, though I am resident at Cambridge, and not at Oxford. Mr. Hargrove mentioned, and I was much impressed with it, the great benefit he had received from the theological lectures at Cambridge, by Dr Westcott among others. One of your students who came to receive a prize from the President is one of your external undergraduate students at Cambridge. He went through the course there with considerable credit, but came away without hearing Dr. Westcott or any other theological lecturer. I asked the question why he did not attend the theological lectures there, and the answer, a very sensible one, was —"I have no time; I have to take my degree in classics." He took a

* This was a mistake. Mr. C. S. Kenny, M.P., Fellow and Law Lecturer of Downing College, Cambridge, was in the room at the time, though I was not aware of it.—R. K. W.

very creditable degree in classics, which he might not have done had he spent his time on other studies. But is it a reasonable thing that a student preparing for the Ministry and for coping with our theological difficulties should go through his course without ever hearing the eminent men associated with the study of theology at the Universities? If theology is to flourish as a science, those who aim at improving it should go where theological studies are systematically carried on by others. I believe that is not the case in London, but it is the case at both the old Universities. I, as a Cambridge man, should be extremely glad if there were any chance of Manchester New College being removed to Cambridge; but, as the second best thing, I advocate its going to Oxford—(hear, hear). Among the many advantages and many grounds of satisfaction connected with the honour so tardily shown to Dr. Martineau, I think we may reckon the opportunity he has had of collecting information which might be of assistance to us in relation to this great subject. The result of the evidence he has collected is this, that the Broad Church authorities at Oxford profoundly dislike and dread the notion of our free theological teachers going there, and that the Orthodox Nonconformists are in the same state of mind. I do not know how that affects the other Trustees, but, so far as I am concerned, it inclines me to do what I should otherwise do, and vote for the proposal before us—(hear, hear, and cries of "Vote").

The CHAIRMAN: As the meeting seems to be getting impatient, and time is getting on, I think it will be better for both sides that I should now ask Mr. Odgers, the mover of the resolution, to reply. It remains with the meeting—(cries of "No" and "Vote").

THE REV. J. E. ODGERS.

I consider it is extremely desirable that we should arrive at a vote with the least possible delay, but you will readily understand that there are a great many points with regard to this debate upon which I should like to say a parting word. I will only say one thing, which is this: that the Committee, wholly apart from the Oxford scheme, have come to the conclusion that they are not to be understood as undertaking the whole of the actual expense of Divinity students for the whole course, and relieving them or their friends entirely from financial anxiety or care. We have come to the determination in any case to abandon anything that could be construed into a policy of the sort. So I have to say, with regard to what Mr. Muirhead said, that we do expect, as in the case of Mansfield, that we shall have certain undergraduate scholars who will bear part of the expense incurred. As I said in the outset, we have a right to claim our share of the young men who are having the great educational advantages which the great middle-class schools are now opening up; and those men who have Scholarships or Exhibitions in addition to the grant will be able to live with fair economy the ordinary undergraduate life. We propose that, as before, a man who takes the Exhibition we give him should go to Glasgow, Owens, University College, or elsewhere, just exactly as he does at present, coming up as a graduate student. There was one thing which I am bound to say pained me. Mr. Nettlefold said, broadly, that our ministers cannot send their sons to Oxford, as if he thought that the sources from which we are to have the ministry of the future were just the families of the ministers, and that it is perfectly vain to look to those sons of laymen who are at Oxford now. I must say that we do certainly hope, if that which is here alluded to has been to a certain extent the case in the past, that a wider understanding of

this College and its underlying principle will attract to its walls, to its lectures, and to the ministry which lies beyond, a number of those who have not hitherto quite seriously and sympathetically thought of the ministry as a possible profession. I would simply say with regard to the theological students that we propose to give them £60 a year, or what will certainly pay all their University dues, and make them unattached students, when they come up with their degrees from Glasgow or elsewhere. You have to remember that the period of residence which we contemplate is twenty four weeks in the year. I will stand no longer between you and the question at issue. I only trust that that broad and deep spirit of sincerity and of mutual respect for differences which has characterised the whole of this debate will, whatever be the issue of our voting, characterise our future relations and our hearty co-operation—(cheers).

The CHAIRMAN: Before putting the resolution to the meeting, I think it well to state again that only those can vote who are subscribers of two guineas and upwards, those gentlemen who receive trusteeship as members of the late University Hall, and the ministers and other like Trustees made under special regulations. I will now put the resolution, moved by the Rev. J. E. Odgers and seconded by the Rev. P. H. Wicksteed:—"That the College be moved from London and established at Oxford."

The CHAIRMAN then put the resolution, and declared it to be carried; 42 votes being given in favour of it and 36 against it.

Mr. MARTINEAU: Mr. Chairman, the vote is extremely near, and it was hoped that the result would be a much more decisive one. It is so near that I do not think our friends who are on the victorious side feel satisfied with their victory. Therefore, would it not be very much better if the question were relegated to the Committee, in order that they might appeal to the whole of the subscribers—(hear, hear, and "No"). If the thing is done we ought to feel that it is done with a large margin of support; but a vote of 42 to 36 does not seem to be very satisfactory. It is very important to know exactly what we are about, and I therefore throw out the suggestion whether an appeal ought not to be made to every Trustee.

Mr. DARBISHIRE: I feel quite certain that those who have spoken on the weaker side have gone into the question very fully. I would remind our friends on the other side of the table that they have had every advantage. The London men are here in force, and the northern men have also come up with much greater exertion. We have had the discussion over and over again. Let us try to see how the scheme is to be worked out. I propose:—"That the decision of the Trustees and the Special Report be remitted to the Committee, with instructions to consider the best mode of carrying out the wishes of the Trustees, and to report specially thereon to the Trustees." That will give the Trustees an opportunity for full discussion. There will be another report and another meeting.

The Rev. ALEXANDER GORDON: I second that resolution as one who did not vote on the original resolution at all. I am not at all in favour of the particular scheme embodied in the Report; but I observe that the resolution just moved does not commit anybody to any detail or to any scheme. I think that in remitting the matter to the Committee the wisest plan has been adopted. With reference to what Mr. Martineau said, I think the Committee are not likely to proceed till they have given very careful consideration to any scheme which may be submitted, and till it has been remitted to a special meeting.

The CHAIRMAN : I think the details should rest with the Committe when they make a special report.

The Rev. A. GORDON : There are many reasons why the schem should be embodied and submitted in a report.

The CHAIRMAN then put the resolution, which was carried.

Mr. MURCH : I beg to move "That the best thanks of the meetin be given to the Chairman for his conduct in the chair."

The Rev. J. WHITEHEAD : I beg to second that.

The motion was carried by acclamation, and the meeting closed.

MANCHESTER NEW COLLEGE.

The College adheres to its original principle of freely imparting Theological knowledge without insisting on the adoption of particular Theological doctrines.

OBSERVATIONS

ON

A PAPER ISSUED TO THE TRUSTEES

BY

DR. MARTINEAU AND OTHERS,

ON THE QUESTION:

Whether the College ought to be Removed to Oxford?"

MANCHESTER,

18th February, 1889.

Churchmen, may be anxious about the establishment of really free teaching in theology, but the exemplification of such teaching, when not hampered by any need of explaining inconsistency, will help on the removal of subscription rather than impede it.

Our friends lay, I believe, too much stress on the division that will exist between students of different years. The best men, who pass high in honours, remain at the University, engaged in tuition and reading for Fellowships, and among them we trust the students of Manchester New College will find some congenial friends, while Undergraduates, who are worth knowing, will be glad to be admitted to the friendship of those who have just taken their degree, and can help them in many ways in the beginning of their University career.

Is there not some inconsistency in the pathetic question, "Is there a Chapel bell that calls the Nonconformist to hear anything but the Prayer Book?" asked by gentlemen who are trying to prevent the erection of a House of Prayer, when the free spirit of untrammelled devotion shall rise to Heaven. Is it right to speak of Oxford and its neighbourhood as without any fallow ground for the seed of a pure and undogmatic faith, while all the world is well aware that in no place is creed-bound religion driving more souls into Positivism, if not absolute unbelief, and that no free voice is lifted up there to point out the better way? I believe that many who would feel lost and helpless in the overwhelming Babel of a great city like London, with its innumerable appeals of confusing variety, would find work enough of a practical kind to fill up every vacant hour their College studies did not demand. No truly Christian heart will be unable to find channels into which it may pour forth its living sympathy. It may, however, be wise to put a wholesome restraint upon the too eager benevolence of youth while dedicated to education.

The final reference to University Hall is unjust to the promoters of the Oxford scheme. Ten of the gentlemen who have signed the objections to it belonged to the Society of University Hall, who, finding themselves unable to carry on that Institution, requested the Trustees of Manchester New College to try whether they could do it more successfully. When they transferred this "Historical Memorial," with its stained windows and painted walls, they were so well aware of the difficulties against which they had vainly struggled, that they only asked for the pledge of a three years' experiment, and made special stipulations as to the way in which the

moneys which might be realised by the sale of the Hall should be used. If any considerations of shame attach to such a sale, the time for its consideration was in 1882, and no trace of it falls on the Trustees of Manchester New College.

These Trustees have a grand inheritance. A College, with traditions not of 40, but of more than 100 years of noble work, done amid sacrifice and difficulty, looks to them for support, and calls upon them, like their predecessors, to adapt its activities to the changed conditions of the present day. Upon their vote much depends. I can only hope they may be guided to a decision which will add a new lustre to the noble story of Manchester New College.

S. ALFRED STEINTHAL.

MANCHESTER, *17th February.*

II.

THE document issued to the Trustees of Manchester New College with the signatures of Dr. Martineau and others, raises a remarkable plea. It pleads for the retention of the College in London, rather than for its establishment in premises of its own at Oxford, on the ground that such new establishment would mark it with a character of permanence, whereas all that it has to look to is "a dignified euthanasia," within fifteen years at most. In this manifesto of the dissentients against the Oxford Scheme, the history of the College is given in terms to which no exception need be taken. Our ancesters were unwilling Nonconformists; and it was only because the University Tests excluded their sons, that they established Academies of their own. It is equally true that, with the opening of the Universities, the descendants of the old English Presbyterians have sent their sons to Oxford and Cambridge. Manchester New College has distinctly found its occupation gone, as an Arts School; and by the foundation of External Scholarships, tenable at the ancient seats of learning, has, in many cases, placed its Divinity Students there side by side with the young Laymen of our Churches, during their undergraduate course. This history is correctly stated; but it is when we part from history that the remarkable character of the document appears. We are told that, as Manchester New College has resigned function after function in the past, so it should be prepared to continue in the path until the story ends by its being relieved of its teaching function, and becoming a mere trustee of theological scholarships, tenable throughout the wide world. It is assumed that the old Universities will, within a few years, become possessed of Divinity Schools which will be what Manchester New College already is, as free as our own *Alma Mater* from all Tests, and as safe custodians of our cherished principle of free learning and free teaching of Theology. When that time arrives, the battle that we and our forefathers have fought so long, will indeed be won; but, *until then, it is surely premature to lay down our arms, and dream of a triumph that can only come from a faithfulness even unto death.* Manchester New College

to-day is still the only Theological School in England that is a true and trustworthy representative of the glorious principle of our Free Churches, handed down from father to son for 200 years. Our allegiance to this principle of freely imparting theological knowledge, without insisting on the adoption of particular doctrines, has been the growth of our history; it is born in us from an honoured ancestry; it is our sacred heirloom; it is the treasure of treasures committed to our stewardship before God and man. We dare not, we cannot, we will not, resign it into the keeping of others reared in creed-bound churches, who, at the best, will be new converts to what, with us, is faith and principle, the very atmosphere in which we live and move, the very life-blood of our hearts. We cannot trust men who will have only just burst their bonds, to be the teachers of that liberty of conscience which, for two centuries, has been the charge placed in our hands. Manchester New College is still called upon to live and strive. And, if it is to live, there are enormously strong reasons why Oxford should be its home, to which the document issued by Dr. Martineau and his friends gives no reply.

If the young laymen of our Churches are there, and if our Divinity Students are there, in large numbers, during their undergraduate years, where should Manchester New College be but near them, folding their young lives in its embrace, keeping before their eyes, and planting in their hearts, its sacred principles? Do the dissentients from the Oxford policy think that there is any other church than our own that would be content to leave its brightest and most hopeful sons, and its future ministers, during their most impressionable years, as sheep without a shepherd, and exposed to any other influence than that in which they were reared, and which hopes to receive the allegiance of their lives? Fancy the Church of England so deserting its scions, or the Congregationalists, with their magnificent foundation of Mansfield College! With such a policy we should *deserve* to lose our laymen, and to see our external scholars for the ministry drafted out of our ranks. Manchester New College at Oxford will become the religious home in which love to our Church will be nurtured in the hearts of those who will be its strength in the future; and it will be the gathering place where, in the College Chapel and in the Professors' homes, lay students and students for the ministry will find each other out and form life-long friendships. So far from the history given in the dissentients' Paper proving that Manchester New College is

not needed at Oxford, it proves that it is bound to follow thither the young men, cleric and lay, of whose religious lives it should be the guardian and the guide.

Turning to the argument that Manchester New College, at Oxford, would only be regarded as one of a "ring of dissenting forts," and would arrest the tendency in the Universities to comprehension, we cannot help the attitude of "the external spectator." We can only hold up our banner, and speak our word, and exert our influence in absolute unconsciousness of any effort so profoundly inconsistent with the principles, the history, and the aims of the College, and of the donors of the University Hall Fund, as the holding of a Sectarian fort of any kind. There in Oxford, at the very centre of the best young life of the nation, it would be ours to raise our protest against Sectarian teaching of Theology, and to deliver our souls on behalf of unbiassed search after the truth of God. There is no place in the land where our deliverance could so reach the growing thought of the coming time. There we should be thankful to seek from men like Dr. Hatch, and Dr. Cheyne, and Dr. Driver, who are as true to our principle of free study as ourselves, the most valuable assistance, by sending our Theological Students to such of their classes as proved suitable. And from a practical point of view, this is one of the very strongest arguments for the removal to Oxford. Our Professors have too many subjects to teach. Since the days when one Theological tutor taught the whole of Divinity at York, theological science has made immense advances; specialisation is the only possible way of keeping up with the demands of the study. In London, for instance, Professor Carpenter teaches Hebrew, Old Testament, Ecclesiastical History, and Comparative Religion—any one of these subjects sufficient for one Chair. In these days, such a system of teaching cannot, and will not, be continued in London or anywhere else. If the College remains in London, its courses will have to be revised. The removal to Oxford would make the revision easy, and it would be accomplished without cost, by enabling us to make use of the classes of the best of the University Professors, which are open free to all members of the University.

On the point of finance, the document issued against us is distinctly liable to a charge of thoughtless exaggeration. The estimate of £150. as the cost of each student, undergraduate and theological, is excessive and misleading. The cost to Manchester New College will be only one of

£75. at most for each Undergraduate, and of £50. for each Theological Student; or an average of £62. 10s. This reduces the total charge from £2,250. to £937. 10s.; or by £1,312. 10s. It does not seem clear why the interest upon the outlay for land and buildings should be charged. That upon the outlay for chapel endowment should certainly not be charged. If the money were given for the purpose of building at Oxford, and would not have been received otherwise, it is not fair—as compared with London—to consider that there would be an additional burden on the College finances of £1,600. a year. The £1,600. a year would not take a penny from existing resources.

If we deduct this £1,600., and the £1,312. 10s., charged in excess, we reduce the entire charge by £2,912. 10s.; and, instead of £5,850., it becomes £2,938. 10s.; and the cost per student, falling upon income of the College from present resources, is reduced from £390. to £196.

There can be no reason for reckoning the private expenses incurred by the students or their friends as part of the cost to be considered by the Trustees of the College. Even including their private expenses, £150. is unnecessarily large. It is quite unreasonable to suppose that the Theological Students living in lodgings at Oxford will have to expend anything approaching £100. a year over their exhibition of £50.; and it is certain that Collegiate Students in licensed lodgings *can* meet the expenses of the three terms, of eight weeks each, on the £75. of their scholarship. Evidence to this effect has been given to the Committee by those whom they trust; and it is quite fair that students who desire to expend more should find it from private resources, or from additional scholarships obtained by themselves. Mr. Lambley, Mr. Fox, Mr. Nicholson, and Mr. Broadbent have all been to Oxford or Cambridge with £50. scholarships from Manchester New College, instead of the £75. now offered. Mr. Tucker is now at Oxford at his own charges. Here is a practical refutation of the statement that only one in twenty of our students could go to Oxford with the increased demands we should make on their private resources. That we should make some such increased demand on them and their friends is an opinion which the Committee have formed wholly apart from the Oxford Scheme. Moreover, we fully expect that the name of Manchester New College at Oxford will attract to it students from higher social ranks than those from which most of our students have been drawn, and that, instead of

reducing the number to a minimum, we shall gain thoughtful recruits from other communions.

Reference is made, in the document under criticism, to the deficiencies of Oxford as a place for the practical training of Ministers. If it were true, it must be confessed that this is a strong plea against the removal in question. But it is felt by many that the precious years of study are short enough, without the distractions of practical activity. The time of scholarly quiet will never return. It is a precious opportunity to be jealously guarded from interruptions. In fact, the student has by no means attained to such a use of his judgment and other faculties that he can really help himself by premature effort of this seductive and absorbing kind. Moreover, the Oxford Session would be shorter than that in London, and the vacations longer. There would be ample time for one or two months' annual sojourn with a congregation, and participation in its work. Mr. Broadbent is in the habit of working thus at Lewes. Nor would it be wholly impossible to try some missionary labour near at hand. It is not to be supposed that in Oxford all of every class in society are satisfied with the churches there in existence. The students of Mansfield find opportunities for missionary operations. Why not ours? As to preaching, Oxford is more central than London.

There is, in the manifesto against Oxford, a very eloquent passage, speaking of the many advantages to the student of life in London. These are undeniable and admitted; but there is another side. London is the most distracting place on earth to a student; and all its distractions are not either religious, political, or philanthropical. There are temptations to dissipation that have not always been resisted by students of Manchester New College. Moreover, a large number of our students enter the ministry in large towns, where the same experiences and problems as are found in London will stare them in the face soon enough. It would be well for the season of quiet preparation to pass in a more scholarly atmosphere, and amid less bustle and confusion. But while this would be the case at Oxford, students would there find themselves in the midst of the most earnest discussion of all social and religious questions, and in the presence of the deepest interest of the most thoughtful minds in all that concerns the welfare of mankind. Dr. Fairbairn has borne testimony that the most devoted ministers, fullest of the missionary spirit, have been those trained at Oxford; and what is the witness borne

by Toynbee Hall? Are they not young University men, who there toil for God and man?

As to University Hall, the loss is about £300., instead of £200. per annum, and is incurred in what is practically a breach of trust on the part of Manchester New College, providing a residence for University College students. The £1,600. a year, on the other hand, the interest of money to be found without touching present resources, would be expended on what we believe vital to Manchester New College itself. Still, no one who has lived in University Hall, and been associated with it for many years, can fail to be touched by the concluding paragraph of the Paper under review. But some of us think that Manchester New College at Oxford would be the true heir to the Hall. The young men for whom the Hall was built, the very grandsons of the builders, have gone to the old Universities; the Hall is deserted by them. Why not sell its stones, while we fly away with its spirit and its traditions; and may be while we carry its windows, with their honoured names, to the University whose doors are now open to all comers?

H. ENFIELD DOWSON.

GEE CROSS, MANCHESTER,
February 16th, 1889.

III.

I CONFESS that the document circulated among the Trustees of Manchester New College, by Dr. Martineau and his co-adjutors, is to me a great surprise. These gentlemen rest their case, first of all, on the contention that within a measurable time, probably not exceeding fifteen years, the need for the very existence of the College will be at an end; and their letter is, in fact, an appeal to us to acquiesce in contemplating its speedy dissolution, and to think only of how most conveniently and decently to make ready for its burial.

Few of us, I think, will see in the signs of the times promise of such speedy transfiguration of the Universities as they anticipate. The dislodgment of the Established Church from her vantage ground can only be effected after a national agitation and a parliamentary conflict which, even after the ground is cleared for action, must occupy an indefinite tale of years. But, even if we could accept these remarkable vaticinations, most of us will be of opinion that our College would still have functions to discharge, not less important than before, in training young men for the ministry of our Free Churches.

I cannot understand why so insuperable a difficulty is anticipated in making the principle of our College understood at Oxford, or inducing Oxford men to distinguish our stand-point—"Free Teaching and Free Learning"—from the doctrinal stand-point of an ordinary Nonconformist College. We are told that "the foremost residents among the tried reformers of Oxford look upon the gravitation of Nonconformist Colleges towards it as a serious check to the spontaneous completion of its national breadth." I believe, on the other hand, that we can bring very good evidence to show that some of these reformers look forward eagerly to the establishment at Oxford of *our* College, with its free teaching and the free worship of its Chapel.

The financial statements in this document seem to me singularly misleading. We also have consulted "frugal and conscientious students," and are well satisfied that a man may pass through Oxford, with every

credit, without anything like the expenditure which is here set down. But we are not only told that each student will need £150. a year; it is added that this is to continue in each case for six years, and that not in one case in twenty can "any help from home be given." These statements are both entirely erroneous.

In all cases where it is more convenient, it will, under the scheme adopted by the Trustees, be perfectly open to the student to take his undergraduate course at Owens', at University College, or elsewhere, as at present, with an annual exhibition of £50., reducing the Oxford period to the three theological years. Moreover, it is an entirely new thing for our College to pay the whole cost of the student's career. In my undergraduate days we received £45. a year only, and I believe that almost every student received substantial support from his own friends. The principle of expecting *nothing* from the parent or other connections of the student has crept into our College administration quite recently, and is, in my view, vicious, and calculated to lower the status of our ministry. I know no reason why our ministers should in future be drawn from poorer strata of society than heretofore.

Taking the memorialists' estimate, we will assume fifteen students at one time in connection with us. Of these, let *seven* be in their theological years, and *eight* undergraduates; of the latter let *four* be students in Oxford colleges, and *four* non-collegiate students, or students at other Universities. The cost, under the scheme adopted, will be—

7	×	£50	=	£350
4	×	£75	=	£300
4	×	£50	=	£200
				£850
Add for Delegacy Fees, Caution Money, &c.			...	£100
				£950

Thus facts give us £950. a year, in place of the memorialists' imaginary £2,250. And it must be repeated that *we have already had* several students at Oxford, receiving from us only £50. *per annum.*

It is singular that among the memorialists, there is not one Divinity Student who has taken his whole course in London. For my own part, I have many happy memories of the London life, but rather in spite of

the surroundings than by aid of them. London is so vast, and the pressure on the time of our students is so severe, that the picture drawn of their life in the eloquent passage on p. 10, of the Address, is imaginary rather than real. In my time, I only remember one student whose superabundant energy led him to derive much advantage from being located in the neighbourhood of "the best Preachers, the chief Men of Science, the first Statesmen and Patriots," and so forth. At Oxford, the Preachers, the Libraries, very often the Statesmen, are all within a few minutes' walk of the student; and that contiguity makes all the difference in their practical influence on his life.

As to the social surroundings in London, I am not aware that more than one or two houses have been thrown open generally to our students, and I imagine that many a sensitive youth has keenly felt his loneliness in the great wilderness of streets. We already know of houses at Oxford which will be open to our men; and I shall be much surprised if the hospitality they there receive will not exceed that which they have hitherto enjoyed.

Finally, as one who for six long years lived in University Hall, I too could half regret that its old days, with the free comradeship of Lay and Divinity Students, cannot be renewed. But we cannot turn back the hand upon the dial. A brighter and larger day is dawning for us. If there could be "shame," it would be in still imprisoning our College in those walls, when the bright young life that used to fill them has drifted away to the Isis and the Cam. The Hall, however, still stands there. If any see a purpose to which it can usefully be applied, let them avail themselves of the present opportunity; but in giving the vote now asked from us, let us bear in mind the impressive warning of the memorialists, that "*it is our duty to pronounce on the question submitted to us on grounds exclusively affecting Manchester New College.*"

R. A. ARMSTRONG.

LIVERPOOL, *February 17, 1889.*

IV.

HAVING been favoured by some members of the College Committee (who have, perhaps, the very best knowledge now available of its principles and aims, and at the same time, the very largest familiarity amongst ministers and laymen, with their desire to extend its influence amongst our own people and beyond our own association), with the observations which have occurred to them on reading the Paper of remonstrance just sent out by Dr. Martineau and his friends, I have thought it well to lay these notes at once before the Trustees, for their further information and guidance.

I have been anxious to send an argument of my own touching some points of the very curious Paper referred to, which certainly seems to me more ingenious than convincing, but so much is so much better said by my companions in the work of the College, that I do not now trouble the Trustees further, except as to one section of that document. This is with regard to the concluding expression of sentiment on behalf of University Hall.

The Hall is justly referred to as a monument of the passing of the Dissenters' Chapels Act, and as hung round with many endearing memorials of our greater men and women of the last generation.

The memorialists rightly admit that it is the duty of the Trustees of the College to pronounce on the question now at issue, on grounds exclusively affecting the College. They close this argument, however, with an appeal to sentiment and "shame" on behalf of the Hall, which naturally, from such friends of the College and the Hall, must appear to have great weight, notwithstanding their disclaimer. Still the disclaimer is only due.

There are, however, some important omissions in that appeal which, in the interest of the College, I seem to be called upon to correct.

The memorialisers add, as a special plea for consideration, that "the rear ground of the Hall is occupied by a building, raised within quite recent years, to meet the demand for more rooms than the Hall itself

supplied." It seems not to have occurred to them to recollect, or perhaps they wrote without knowing, that the additional rooms were built by the Trustees of the College, out of its own funds, in order to give the maintenance of the Hall in their hands the fullest possible trial. The outlay was a contribution by the College to the Hall property, which it expects to recover as part of the Hall Fund.

But the Paper concludes as follows:—

> "*And now this property is to be sold, as if there were neither memory nor trust attached to it, to any purchaser in the open market. It is, we confess, with some shame, as well as pain, that we contemplate this collateral incident of the proposed removal to Oxford.*"

And the memorial speaks of the Hall, as a friendly sheltering Institution, as if it was still living.

Whether this appeal to feeling should have been addressed to the Trustees of the College on a College question, or to any other friends of the Hall on its account or not, it can scarcely be deemed as clearly stated as it should have been. in a College Paper. Some of the gentlemen who signed that Paper at least cannot possibly have forgotten that, in 1881, the Council of "The Society of University Hall, London," came to the conclusion that they could not carry on the Institution, and proposed to determine the original Trust, and make the property over to Manchester New College, in aid of its resources, if the College would pay their debts and make a fair experiment as to carrying on the Hall under its auspices. In fact, it was the Society itself which, at two General Meetings, did actually dissolve itself, and abandoned its Trust, its heirlooms, memorials, portraits and all, and made over its property to Trustees upon trust for the occupation of the Hall by the College, for three years at least, and then from year to year till the College should cease to occupy it; and upon further trust, on the cesser of such occupation, that they "*shall sell*" the whole by public auction or private contract, repay the College its disbursements on account of liabilities of the Hall, restorations of the premises, and some other expenses, and then hold the nett proceeds of sale, either to be paid to the College, or applied by them in aid of its purposes. If any appeal to "shame" and "pain" was called for, it was certainly not to the Trustees of the College that it had to be addressed. But I plead against any such inuendo on behalf of the Hall Society, when I point out that in the constitution of the New Trust which

was to take the place of the original Hall Trust, it was carefully provided that, if paid to the College, the fund should be kept apart in its books under the special designation of "The University Hall Fund," and that the same and the income thereof should be applied, either separately or with other funds of the College, in furtherance of the purposes and operations of the College, subject always to the fundamental direction, which was, I believe, the very Trust of the Hall;—

> "That the application thereof shall always be in harmony with the great principle of unlimited religious liberty, and of the right of private judgment as paramount to the profession of any peculiar theological tenets, so that the Fund may be permanently employed for advancing the progress of liberal education, and promoting the free exercise of individual judgment in matters of Religion."

If the Trustees should decide to retain the fund in their hands, they were to apply the whole, or parts thereof, and the income thereof, as they should think fit, under the distinctive name aforesaid, in furtherance of the purposes and operations of the College, subject always to the fundamental direction.

The Society deemed this College the fittest possible guardian of its real trust, meaning, and intentions, and perfectly secured their substantial continuance when the time had come, as it will sometimes come to institutions, for an exhaustive revision of the original scheme of their foundation, by handing the value over to the College. I venture to say that, in thus saving the contributions of our fathers for the express perpetuation of the fundamental direction they impressed upon their gifts in the hands of the College, which must and will live, while religion and theology and philosophy and letters inspire our people with ever new life and courage, and the truest missionary zeal, the Hall Society vindicated its purpose with dignity and honour.

If any desire to re-consecrate the building of University Hall to any new piety, or any new benevolence, it may be "shame" and "pain" to them not to seize the opportunity of, at once, doing that as they think best, and heaping up sovereigns to the memory of the Founders of the Hall, and the development of the outfit of the College in its pilgrimage towards the Beautiful House; but there is no question of either in our present controversy.

It is certain that the College cannot be manipulated in the service of any other cause; much less bled to death in hopeless transfusion.

To members of the Society of the Hall who once for all parted with their interest in it, and have not cared to attach themselves by labour or subscriptions to the College, I appeal not to let a sentiment for the dead walls induce them to vote against the resurrection of the Spirit of this old Trust.

To all other Ministers of the College, believing as I do, that the opportunity and the duty of the College *now* is to go to Oxford, I do most earnestly urge that this particular appeal, and indeed the whole Paper of subtle obstruction rather than of opposition, ought to have no weight with the Friends and Supporters of this, our noblest effort for free piety, free thought, and free teaching, for our own people and our successors, and for any brethren who may be led to seek the light of our little candle, such as it is.

R. D. DARBISHIRE.

February 17th, 1889.

V.

I WAS away from home all yesterday, and could not write till this morning. As to the Memorialists' Address, I cannot recover from my first astonishment. It is an alternative policy—with a vengeance! and its name is Euthanasia, or the Happy Despatch. We are invited to consider, in the name of the highest principle and the truest fidelity to the history and traditions of the College, that the true fulfilment of its destiny, and the triumph of its essential and informing idea, is to be attained by its extinction, probably within ten or fifteen years.

We, especially of the Committee, have a right seriously to complain. The application of the College principle to the questions of the day, as they arise, is a primary duty, which has never been overlooked in our councils, in so far as my participation in them has gone. An appeal to it, an interpretation of it, made thus late in the day, must make each of us pause and reflect, as dispassionately as we can. But *if* our London Trustees have had this view of the future of the College in their minds, why have they never produced it before? Why did we never hear a word of it in June or in January? Five of the Signers have spoken at one or the other of the Trustees' Meetings, three of them at both, and at length—and we have heard objections to Oxford, and arguments for London—but never a hint that in time, if all goes well, all our students may take their Theology at Oxford *without our Professors*, and that London is to be regarded as affording only a *domus transitoria* until this happy consummation is reached. I protest that this is not fair dealing *with us*, at least; and I gravely doubt whether it is fair that those Trustees who have not been present at the Meetings should be appealed to, to judge a wholly *new issue*,—not that which was submitted at those Meetings.

There is surely a strange omission in the first and main portion of this Address. It would have much cogency if we were compelled to make the

saddening confession that we had been only *waiting*, had done nothing but maintain an abstract principle; and that this had borne no fruit with consideration during the last 200 years. But is this so? Has the principle of free learning and free teaching been fruitless of result? Has it cultivated no attitude of mind, no critical temper, no development of faith, which is worth preserving? If it has, will all these be found suddenly developed in the Theological Chairs of the older Universities, the moment the regulations as to Subscription disappear from the Calendar? Have our generations of theological thought and method, "broadening slowly down" in a free air, produced nothing which we must care to see duly represented in the teaching of the next century—which generations of bondage to creed and articles cannot transmit to their suddenly-emancipated successors?

The case of the Churches of kindred origin with the College is surely analagous. Have they, too, been only *waiting?* and has their testimony of truth been merely negative? Surely they have developed life and thought without which the religious future of England will be the poorer. If the Act of Uniformity were repealed to-morrow, I, for one, could not say that it was our duty to shut up our old Presbyterian Chapels at once, to silence the free-born, and leave our children to take their chance in that struggle between Anglo-Catholicism and Agnostic conformity, which, whatever Parliament may do, will divide the Church of England in the next generation.

But if we share the hope here expressed—and I do so most fervently—that before many years Subscription will be no longer required from the occupants of Divinity Chairs at Oxford—is not this an additional reason why we should do all we can to insure that every good result of *our* free teaching has fair play and representation, in the free teaching of the Oxford that is to be? We must not stand apart; we must be ready to contribute to the teaching staff of the new Open Faculty men approved by Oxford standards, ranking among her distinguished sons, who know her men and her methods, and who, besides this, can bring to the task they undertake that mixture of sobriety and fearlessness, of conscientious independence and sympathetic understanding of opposing systems, which stands to many of us as the distinguishing mark of our College, our heritage from the past, and our ideal still. Our men must be at Oxford, if they are to have a share in the Oxford teaching of the future.

I will not attempt any criticism of the latter portion of the Address. If the premises be admitted, it certainly is not worth while to do anything, and the renewed interest in the College which, I believe, the Oxford movement has aroused, may be suffered to die out again. I need only point out once again the over-estimate of students' necessary expenses. We offer to a non-collegiate student, whether undergraduate or theological, £50. a year—which is more than £2. a week for three terms of eight weeks each; and I maintain that this is sufficient *assistance*, as the College is responsible for University dues and charges. To the Collegiate Student we offer £75. I have a letter from a distinguished College Tutor at Oxford about my son. He says, "I do not know whether pecuniary considerations enter at all into his case, but I may say that a commoner with us may (if he chooses) keep all his necessary expenses within £100. a year, and they frequently do so."

Our last undergraduate cost us £100. a year at the Hall; what did his friends do for him, I wonder? He left because he did not pass his examinations, and is now at Oxford, as a non-collegiate student, and the money is forthcoming. I will have no part or lot in any return to the theory that the College is to undertake the *whole* expense of the student, vacations and all, because he is going to be a Minister.

J. EDWIN ODGERS.

BOWDON,
February 18th, 1889.

MANCHESTER NEW COLLEGE,

OXFORD.

HISTORICAL MEMORANDUM,

APPEAL,

AND

LIST OF SUBSCRIPTIONS.

Subscriptions may be made payable at once, or in one, two, or three yearly instalments.

Promises are earnestly invited;—to be made to any of the Officers who sign the Appeal.

HISTORICAL MEMORANDUM.

THE TRUSTEES have decided to remove the College to Oxford. It appears desirable at this crisis to renew among its friends, and perhaps to extend more widely amongst others interested in liberal theological movements, the knowledge of some particulars of its History and Principles.

The College, which for more than a hundred years has borne a name identifying it with Manchester, the place of its establishment in the year 1786, can trace back its ancestry for more than a century beyond that date. It is clearly derived from the earliest Nonconformist Academy, opened by Richard Frankland, one of the ejected clergy of 1662, in his family house at Rathmell, in Craven, in the year 1670. This was done in the face of that legislation which sought to complete the humiliation and misery inflicted on the Non-conforming clergy by the Act of Uniformity, by forbidding them, or any member of their families, to engage in *teaching*, under a penalty of £40. The object of such an enactment was not merely to deprive a learned class of an obvious means of support, but to condemn the rising generation of Nonconformists to ignorance, and consequent loss of that social status and influence which many of their fathers carried with them into their poverty and suffering. Frankland's Academy was for "University learning." He and his pupils had to flee from officers, spies, and informers, and find temporary resting-places in the remoter parts of Westmoreland, Yorkshire, and North Lancashire; so that the Academy made its sixth change of locality when, in 1689, the year of the Toleration Act, it settled again at Rathmell, where it remained until Frankland's death, in 1698. He educated 304 students, lay and divinity. His work was continued by a series of tutors, who, with occasional assistance, gave instruction in all that passed as "University learning,"—the students going to the man, wherever the approved teacher might be settled. In this succession we have the names of John Chorlton (Manchester, 1699—1705), James Coningham (Manchester, 1705—1712), Thomas Dixon, M.D. (Whitehaven, 1710—1723; Bolton, 1723—1729), Caleb

Rotheram (Kendal, 1733—1752). There was an understood continuity throughout these successive stages; Chorlton was a pupil of Frankland, Dixon of Chorlton, Rotheram of Dixon; and the institution was known as the "Northern Academy." This succession being terminated, apparently, by the death of Mr. Rotheram, in 1752, and an academy at Findern, in Derbyshire, which had been carried on since 1720, having also come to an end through the death of its tutor, Dr. Ebenezer Latham, a circular of proposals for the more definite foundation of an academy in the North of England, was issued by an influential committee. This led to the establishment of the Warrington Academy, opened in the year 1757, Lord Willoughby of Parham, being president, and Sir Henry Hoghton, the recognised leader of the Lancashire Presbyterians, being vice-president. The undertaking aimed at gathering into one place a sufficient number of representative scholars, and consequently a division and extension of the subjects of teaching, which had been impossible under one tutor.

Among the Warrington tutors, the names of Drs. Aikin, Taylor, Enfield, Priestley, and Gilbert Wakefield, are deservedly conspicuous. Among the 393 students who received instruction at the Warrington Academy, during the 29 years of its existence, were many who made their mark not only in the history of our churches, but in politics, in law, in the army, and, especially, in medical science.

Before the dissolution of the Warrington Academy in 1786, steps had been already taken towards establishing in Manchester, "a Seminary of learning, similar in its objects and its plan,"—the plan being such as to "afford a full and systematic education for Divines, and preparatory instruction for the other learned professions, as well as for civil and commercial life." "This Institution," it is declared, "will be open to young men of every religious denomination, from whom no test or confession of faith will be required." The Rev. Dr. Thos. Barnes and the Rev. Ralph Harrison (both old Warrington students), were the first tutors of the "Manchester Academy," in which the Warrington Institution was revived.

At the same time a College was organised at Hackney, for the South of England, on the same lines. This Institution was dissolved many years ago.

In 1803, it was resolved to remove the Academy to York, in order to place it in the charge of the Rev. Charles Wellbeloved, under whom, together with the Revs. W. Turner and John Kenrick, the men whose names are most closely connected with the history of the College, and the Churches of kindred origin, for the greater part of this century,—Robberds, Madge, Wallace, Tayler, Aspland, Martineau, Gaskell, Beard, G. V. Smith, and P. P. Carpenter,—received their theological education.

In 1839, Mr. Wellbeloved being advanced in years, and desiring to be relieved of his duties, the question arose of moving the College to London, or back to Manchester. The latter alternative was adopted, and, in 1840, it was re-established in Manchester, as Manchester New College, with a full staff of Professors, and with special enlargements in the direction of its Literary and Scientific Department, as well as of that of Theology.

The expectation of the Trustees,—that a large number of lay students would be attracted, that the College would become, in fact, what the Owens College has, in later days, become,—was not realised; and in 1852, a resolution was passed in favour of the removal of the College to London, where, by connexion with University College, the expense of maintaining a faculty of Arts might be dispensed with. From 1853 to the present year, the College has occupied rooms in University Hall (an Institution commemorating in its foundation the passing of the Dissenters' Chapels Act in 1844, and designed as a place of residence for students attending University College). There, it was hoped, the students of Manchester New College would associate with the young laity of our free churches. The latter, however, since the opening of the older Universities to students of all denominations, have less and less resorted to the Hall, and it has lately fallen into the hands of the College to use and manage.

In 1888, and again in the present year, resolutions were passed at meetings of Trustees authorising the removal of the College to Oxford,—a project which has long been before the Committee and Trustees, having been the subject of Special Reports in 1875, and of Special Meetings in 1879. At Oxford, then, the College will open its next Session, 1889-90, as an open faculty of Theology; trusting there to find

new and enlarged scope for the application of its original principle of freely imparting theological learning without insisting on the adoption of particular doctrines.

While the Institution, in the earlier periods of its existence, had the distinction, with the Hackney College, of providing a liberal education entirely free from doctrinal restrictions, and its funds are still held in trust "for the purpose of giving University learning to those who seek it, without test or confession of faith," the gradual liberation of secular teaching in the older Universities and elsewhere, has, by degrees, limited the sphere and marked the special calling of our College to that of Theology and its connected branches of learning. In this department the College is now, we believe, the only one in Britain (save the kindred institution at Carmarthen), which stands for the principle of "*Free Teaching and Free Learning in Theology.*" It thus constitutes a signal exception to the statement recently made by Professor Huxley in the "Nineteenth Century," that "Holland and Germany are the only two countries in which, at the present time, professors of Theology are to be found whose tenure of their posts does not depend on the results to which their inquiries lead them." The Professors and Students of Manchester New College are entirely unpledged to any particular doctrines and opinions. Its classes are open to all students who appear competent to avail themselves of them; and while offering assistance in the form of exhibitions to students who attach themselves to it with a view to specific preparation for the ministry, the College does not seek to confine even them to the service of any particular denomination.

At a time when every religious affirmation is subjected to persistent question and criticism, and that, too, by men of commanding ability and world-wide reputation, we believe that in unswerving loyalty to the principle we have stated lies the only hope of the survival of intelligent religious belief. A religion which is known to be taught in accordance with prescribed rules awakens the suspicion of thoughtful men; while a religion which has been fostered in an atmosphere of absolutely free inquiry will at least command their respectful consideration.

Herein lies, indeed, the weightiest contribution which the College has to offer towards renewing the Religious Life of our country, namely, in the strong free personal piety which it has been its privilege and delight

to cherish, because it has thought freely, and taught honestly, whatever it could learn, on true scientific principles, from the world around, from Philosophy, from Literature, and from the History of Man, and of his modest advance towards the Light of the Countenance of God.

APPEAL.

After the most careful consideration, and by votes thrice given, the Trustees of Manchester New College have resolved to remove the College to Oxford.

A most earnest appeal is now made to all trustees, subscribers, old students, and friends of the College, to forget differences, and to give to this measure the loyal and generous support upon which the method and efficiency of carrying it out must depend. The record of the past inspires confidence in the future. Through its various changes of location, whether at Manchester, York, or London, Manchester New College has retained the unshaken allegiance of the members of the Free Churches of the United Kingdom. There has been ever the same faithful devotion to its interests, and the same unwavering love of its principles. The College has been recognised as the source and fountainhead of the highest and best life of churches whose very breath is Free Piety and that Free Learning and Free Teaching of Theology, of which for generations its Professors have been the foremost exponents.

To maintain the College in its high position, and to enable it to do its sacred work, fully equipped to meet every demand, has been the aim, faithfully fulfilled, of all those earnest men and women who have been its unfailing supporters during its long and varied history. Never was such fidelity to the cause of Manchester New College more needed than now. A step of momentous importance has been taken. Its success will add new life and strength and influence to the religion of which the College is the highest and truest representative in the land. Its failure would be nothing less than a disaster.

Therefore to all the members of the Free Churches, as sharing herein the gravest responsibility, this Appeal is made. Whether they were in favour of the removal to Oxford, or not, makes no difference. The College is still theirs, the teacher of their ministers, the truest guardian of their

principles, and the very noblest exponent of their thought and life. The plea comes to all alike, to advocates of each scheme for the future of the College, for support with might and main. There is but one duty incumbent on all to whom Manchester New College is dear, and that is to work unitedly to secure the best possible result for the new policy.

To establish the College at Oxford, it has been estimated that something like £45,000. is required; £35,000. for land and buildings, furnishing, removal, &c., (including the Chapel,) and £10,000. for endowment of the Chapel. The estimate is based upon careful inquiries on the spot, and upon rough plans kindly furnished by Mr. Thomas Worthington, acting as a member of the Committee. The buildings will include Library, Hall, Lecture-rooms, Professors' and Students' common rooms; besides the Chapel.

There are many friends of Manchester New College who approve the project of a College Chapel, although they may have objected to the removal of the College itself. It will be quite open to them, if they please, to contribute specially either to the building or endowment of the College Chapel; and donations are cordially invited for these particular objects. As to the Chapel endowment, it is obvious that the College finances cannot bear the new burden of the Chapel expenses; and it is thought better to meet it by providing sufficient endowment for the Chapel, rather than by trusting to anything so precarious, and so difficult to maintain, as an increase of the Subscription List for this special purpose.

The entire £45,000. has to be raised by donations, as the capital accruing, as "Hall Fund," to Manchester New College, from the sale of University Hall will, in the main, only recoup to the College the £6,000. already sunk there, and provide "the University Hall Fund" which has to be invested, to add to the income of the College.

The appeal for the completion of this £45,000. is made with the more confidence, since—in several cases without solicitation—donations have already been promised to the amount of £28,405. 2s. 0d.

The amount still required is, therefore, nearly £17,000.; and this appeal for that additional sum is most earnestly commended to the consideration of all friends of Manchester New College. It is issued with a profound sense of the duty that lies upon every member of the Free Churches to

come forward with the help requisite to establish the College in its new home, in a manner worthy of its high traditions and its sacred calling and its great hopes of usefulness.

Signed,

HENRY R. GREG,
President.

S. ALFRED STEINTHAL,
Chairman of Committee.

R. D. DARBISHIRE,
H. ENFIELD DOWSON,
} *Secretaries.*

J. EDWIN ODGERS,
Chairman Oxford Council.

Treasurer, D. AINSWORTH, Esq., 38, Barton Arcade,
Manchester.

LIST OF SUBSCRIPTIONS.

JUNE 27, 1889.

	£.	s.	d.
Mr. W. Hollins	5,000	0	0
Mr. H. Tate	5,000	0	0
Mr. Thos. Ashton	2,000	0	0
Mrs. J. Worthington	1,000	0	0
Mr. George Holt	1,000	0	0
Mr. C. W. Jones	1,000	0	0
In Memory of Mr. S. D. Darbishire	1,000	0	0
Mr. J. P. Thomasson	1,000	0	0
Mr. H. W. Gair	1,000	0	0
Mr. F. Nettlefold	1,000	0	0
Mr. W. J. Colfox	1,000	0	0
Mr. W. P. Price	500	0	0
Mr. Walter Holland	500	0	0
Mr. G. W. Brown	500	0	0
Mr. A. F. Osler	500	0	0
Sir J. Kitson	500	0	0
Mr. Alfred Holt	500	0	0
Mr. Wm. Tate	500	0	0
Mr. F. H. Gossage	500	0	0
Mrs. G. Buckton	500	0	0
Mr. H. Tate, Jun.	500	0	0
Mr. Joshua Buckton	300	0	0
Mr. H. R. Greg	250	0	0
Rev. J. E. Odgers	250	0	0
Mr. W. Long	250	0	0
Mr. C. C. Dunkerley	250	0	0
Mr. W. Bowring	250	0	0
Mr. Russell Scott	200	0	0
Carried forward...	£26,750	0	0

SUBSCRIPTIONS—continued.

	£.	s.	d.
Brought forward...	26,750	0	0
Miss Valentine	200	0	0
Mr. W. D. Houghton	100	0	0
Rev. H. E. Dowson	100	0	0
A Donor's First Gift	100	0	0
Mr. R. Harrop	100	0	0
Mr. Joseph Lupton	100	0	0
Mr. John Lupton	100	0	0
Mrs. F. W. Kitson	100	0	0
Mr. J. E. Taylor	100	0	0
Miss Mary White	100	0	0
Mr. Harry Rawson	50	0	0
Mr. S. B. Worthington	50	0	0
Mrs. Cliffe	50	0	0
A Friend	50	0	0
Mrs. S. W. Browne	50	0	0
Mr. F. M. Lupton	50	0	0
Mr. W. Brierley	30	0	0
Mr. A. W. Worthington	25	0	0
Mr. J. S. Mathers	25	0	0
Mrs. Edwd. Enfield	25	0	0
Miss White	25	0	0
Rev. H. S. Tayler	21	0	0
Mr. Thos. Worthington	21	0	0
Rev. James Harwood	21	0	0
Mr. R. Robinson	20	0	0
Mr. C. Lupton	15	0	0
Rev. S. A. Steinthal	10	0	0
Rev. Brooke Herford	10	0	0
Miss M. Dowson	5	0	0
Miss E. M. Dowson	2	2	0
	£28,405	2	0

ADDITIONAL SUBSCRIPTIONS.

	£.	s.	d.
Mrs. Nettlefold	200	0	0
Mrs. Colfox	100	0	0
Mrs. Luccock	100	0	0
"N. J. F."	100	0	0
Mr. E. Clephan	100	0	0
Rev. P. M. Higginson	100	0	0
A Friend, "H." (1st Donation)	100	0	0
Rev. J. Collins Odgers	50	0	0
Mr. Walter Ashton	25	0	0
Miss H. E. Higginson	25	0	0
Mr. R. R. Meade-King	25	0	0
Miss Talbot	25	0	0
Mr. F. J. Kitson	25	0	0
Mr. H. W. Hill	21	0	0
"Octogenarian"	20	0	0
Miss S. H. Holland	10	0	0
Mrs. R. Crompton Jones	10	0	0
"S. W."	10	0	0
Mr. Priestley Smith	5	0	0
	£1,051	0	0

Library also has:

v.2: Ja.20, F.17, Mr.10, 24, 31, Ap.7, 21, Je.2, 9, 16, Ag.18, S.8, O.13, 27, N.24, D.1, 15, 29 (1923)
v.3: 4-5, 9, 12, 14-17, 21-22, 24, 28-31, 38-41, 43-48 (1924)
v.4: 1-3:1, 4-11, 21-32, 34-43, 45-46. (1925)
v.5: 1-2, 5, 8-13, 15, 18-20, 22, 24, 26-28, 30-31, 40-41, 47 (1926)
v.6: 1-38, 40-47. 1927

CBPac

Duplex
Photomount
Pamphlet
Binder
Gaylord Bros.
Makers
Stockton, Calif.
PAT. JAN. 21, 1908